PROGRESS PUBLISHERS

STUDENT'S LIBRARY

A History of Classical Sociology

PROGRESS PUBLISHERS

STUDENT'S LIBRARY

This is a study of the shaping and development of sociology in Western Europe, the United States, and Russia at the turn of the century, a period particularly important for the establishing of sociology as an independent discipline. The authors examine its development from social philosophy to sociology proper, and discuss how it grew from the rather vague programme it was, for example, in the conceptions of Auguste Comte, into a leading social science at the beginning of the twentieth century. They trace how it developed its conceptual apparatus, and how it began a systematic treatment of problems of the methodology and techniques of research.

The contribution to sociology of the great spokesmen of its classical period, like Tönnoes, Simmel, Durkheim, Max Weber, and Pareto, are examined in detail

A History of Classical Sociology

1 p. 70 к.

ISBN 5–01–001102–6

STUDENT'S LIBRARY

A History of Classical Sociology

Edited by Prof *I. S. Kon*
Translated by *H. Campbell Creighton,* M.A. (Oxon)

PROGRESS PUBLISHERS
MOSCOW

Student's Library

Editorial Board: F. M. Volkov (Managing Editor), Ye. F. Gubsky (Deputy Managing Editor), V. G. Afanasyev, Taufik Ibrahim, Zafar Imam, I. S. Kon, I. M. Krivoguz, A. V. Petrovsky, Yu. N. Popov, Munis Reza, N. V. Romanovsky, V. A. Tumanov, A. G. Zdravomyslov, V. D. Zotov

Коллектив авторов (*отв. редактор И. С. Кон*)

История социологии XIX-начала XX века

На английском языке

Редактор русского текста Р о к о т я н Н. С.
Редакторы английского текста П о н о м а р е н к о С. В.,
Ш а ф р а н о в В. П.
Художник Г о р д о н В. Б.
Художественный редактор К р а с о в с к и й С. В.
Технический редактор Ю х а н о в а М. Г.

ИБ № 17103

Сдано в набор 01.08.88. Подписано в печать с РОМ 18.04.89. Формат 84x108 1/32. Бумага офсетная № 1. Гарнитура Пресс Роман. Печать офсетная. Условн. печ. л. 19,74. Усл. кр.-отт. 39,88. Уч-изд. л. 22,65. Тираж 15230 экз. Заказ №1147. Цена 1 р. 70 к. Изд. № 45235.

Ордена Трудового Красного Знамени издательство "Прогресс" Государственного комитета СССР по делам издательств, полиграфии и книжной торговли.
119847, ГСП, Москва, Г-21, Зубовский бульвар,17.

Можайский полиграфкомбинат В/О "Совэкспорткнига" Государственного комитета СССР по делам издательств, полиграфии и книжной торговли.
143200, Можайск, ул. Мира, 93.

© Издательство «Наука», 1979

English translation © Progress Publishers 1989

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

И $\frac{0302000000-243}{014(01)-89}$ 17–89

ISBN 5–01–001102–6

CONTENTS

Page

Introduction (by *Igor Kon*) 5
1. From Social Philosophy to Sociology (by *Igor Kon*). . . 9
2. Auguste Comte and the Origin of Positivist Sociology (by *Elena Osipova*) 22
3. Herbert Spencer's Sociological Conception (by *Igor Kon*) 43
4. Naturalism in Sociology of the Turn of the Century (by *Alexander Hofman* and *Alexander Kovalev*) 57
5. The Psychological Sociology of the Turn of the Century (by *Igor Kon*) 96
6. Empirical Social Studies in the Nineteenth Century (by *Marina Kovaleva*) 122
7. The Crisis of Evolutionism and the Antipositivist Trends in Sociology at the Turn of the Century (by *Igor Kon*) 151
8. Ferdinand Tönnies' Sociological Conception (by *Leonid Ionin*) 173
9. Georg Simmel's Sociology (by *Leonid Ionin*) 189
10. Emile Durkheim's Sociology (by *Elena Osipova*) 206
11. The Sociology of Max Weber (by *Piama Haidenko*) . . . 255
12. The Sociological System of Vilfredo Pareto (by *Elena Osipova*) 312
13. Sociology in Prerevolutionary Russia (by *Igor Golosenko*) 337
Conclusion (by *Igor Kon*) 357

Subjet Index . . . . . .
Name Index . . . . . .

INTRODUCTION

Igor Kon

A necessary element of any science's self-awareness is its history. By tracing the historical development of their disciplines scholars and scientists understand their contemporary state and their contradictions and problems better. Not surprisingly, interest in the history of a science grows as the latter develops. And that fully applies to sociology.

In contrast to the natural sciences, sociology's own history is not a side issue but a serious problem studied by the same methodological means (including quantitative procedures) as other social problems.

Of late, the proportion of historical sociological studies in the sociological literature has risen considerably. And its themes have broadened. Alongside the history of sociological theory there has arisen the history of empirical sociology, and much attention has begun to be paid to the history of the institutionalisation of sociology and to study of its social functions and of its relations with other sciences.

In 1970, at the Seventh World Sociological Congress, a research committee on the history of sociology was set up on the initiative of the Soviet delegates within the International Sociological Association. In 1978 publication began in the United States of a special journal on the history of sociology. Matters of its history now have a notable place in the proceedings of international sociological congresses and symposia on the history of science.

There are great difficulties, however, in the way of develop-

ing a scientific history of sociology. The history of any science includes the history of the forming of its subject-matter, methods, conceptual apparatus, inner logical structures, the sphere of its practical application, its institutionalisation and relations with other disciplines, and the relations of the various schools and currents in the science itself. But interdisciplinary boundaries are mobile and shifting. Even today the subject-matter of sociology is by no means defined in an identical way. And unity has been impossible, furthermore, throughout its history. An author's ideological and theoretical stance, and his understanding of the contemporaneous state of sociology, also affect his historical conceptions. The very principles of the structure and periodisation of the history of sociology is very different with different writers.

Without going into the historiography of the subject, which still awaits study, one can list a number of principles underlying monographs and courses in the history of sociology:

(1) a simple exposition of the views of various sociologists and schools in chronological order, with a minimum of analysis of their content;[1]

(2) organisation of the material on a space-time principle, i.e., by separate countries and periods;[2]

(3) examination of sociological ideas and theories as an aspect and element of a broader history of socio-political thought on a background of changes in socio-economic, political, and ideological attitudes;[3]

(4) the history of the succession and development of sociological theory as a specialised system of knowledge, the various currents of sociological thought being treated either as a stage in the moulding and preparation of an author's own conceptions, or as alternative, mutually supplementing streams;[4]

(5) a history of the shaping or manifestation in sociology of some definite, quite general philosophical orientation, for example, positivism;[5]

(6) the history of the evolution of certain fundamental sociological categories, whose content and functions have changed in the various stages of society's development;[6]

(7) a series of monographic essays on outstanding sociologists of the past, each being studied in relation to the features of his

time, personality, and scientific activity, and in a certain historical perspective;[7]

(8) a series of essays on separate, most important concrete studies, tracing the evolution of the relationship of theoretical conceptions and empirical methods of research;[8]

(9) the biographical approach, in which the content of sociological conceptions is deduced from a sociologist's personal features and life;[9]

(10) the history of empirical social studies, with reliance on the development of the methodology and technique of research;[10]

(11) the history of the institutionalisation of sociology and its conversion into a university discipline, the founding and development of scientific institutions, university chairs, journals, etc.;[11]

(12) a retrospective analysis of certain very important contemporary problems as they have been posed by major sociologists of the past.[12]

In the present volume we trace the forming and development of non-Marxian sociology in Western Europe, the USA, and Russia in the nineteenth century and early twentieth. This, of course, is thematically, chronologically, and geographically incomplete, but such a division of the subject seems legitimate to us since the period singled out was specially important for the establishing of sociology as an idependent science, while the most intensive development of Marxist sociology took place later in the post-1917 period and needs to be treated in a separate volume.

The authors hope that these essays on the history of sociology of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries in the West and in pre-revolutionary Russia, written from a Marxian standpoint, will interest readers in the West.

Notes

[1] V. I. Lenin. Materialism and Empirio-Criticism. In: *Collected Works* (Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977), Vol. 14.

[2] Heinz Maus. *A Short History of Sociology* (Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1962); G. Duncan Mitchell. *A Hundred Years of Sociology* (Duckworth, London, 1968).

[3] Jan Szczepański. *Socjologia. Rozwój Problematyki i Metod* (Państw. Wydawn. Naukowe, Warsaw, 1969); Howard Becker and H. E. Barnes. *Social Thought from Lore to Science*, Vol. 3. (Dover Publications, New York, 1961).

[4] Nicholas S. Timasheff. *Sociological Theory, Its Nature and Growth*, 3rd ed. (Doubleday, New York, 1955); Talcott Parsons. *The Structure of Social Action*, 2nd ed. (The Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., 1949); Don A. Martindale. *The Nature and Types of Sociological Theory* (Houghton & Mifflin, Boston, Mass., 1960).

[5] I. S. Kon. *Der Positivismus in der Soziologie* (Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, 1968); Anthony Giddens. *Positivism and Sociology* (Heinemann, London, 1974).

[6] Robert A. Nisbet. *The Sociological Tradition* (Basic Books, New York, 1966).

[7] Lewis A. Coser. *Masters of Sociological Thought. Ideas in Historical and Social Context*, 2nd ed. (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, New York, 1977); Franco Ferrarotti. *Il Pensiero Sociologico da Auguste Comte a Max Horkheimer* (Milan, 1974); Gianfranco Poggi. *Images of Society. Essays on the Sociological Theories of Tocqueville, Marx and Durkheim* (Stanford U.P., Stanford, Cal., 1972).

[8] John Madge. *The Origins of Scientific Sociology* (Tavistock Publications, London, 1970).

[9] Arthur Mitzman. *Iron Cage: An Historical Interpretation of Max Weber* (Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1970).

[10] Bernard Lécuyer and Anthony R. Oberschall."The Early History of Social Research". In: *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, Vol. 15 (The Macmillan Co., and The Free Press, New York, 1968), pp. 36-53.

[11] Terry Nichols Clark. *Prophets and Patrons: The French University and the Emergence of the Social Sciences* (Harvard U.P., Cambridge, Mass., 1973); A. Oberschall (Ed.). *The Establishment of Empirical Sociology. Studies in Continuity, Discontinuity, and Institutionalisation* (Harper & Row, New York, 1972).

[12] Luciano Cavalli. *Il Mutamento Sociale. Sette Ricerche sulla Civilità Occidentale*, 2nd ed. (Il Mulino, Bologna, 1971).

1

FROM SOCIAL PHILOSOPHY TO SOCIOLOGY

Igor Kon

1. The Ideological and Theoretical Premisses of Sociological Knowledge

Sociology arose in the middle of the nineteenth century as an independent science of the patterns of development and functioning of social systems, not because a new object of study had appeared, but because problems had developed in other social sciences that could not be tackled by the traditional means and within the bounds of the existing system of knowledge.

The sociological vision of the world (or sociological style of thinking) presupposes (1) a view of society as a systemic whole functioning and developing according to its own laws, 'and not as something mechanically concatenated and therefore permitting all sorts of arbitrary combinations of separate social elements';[1] (2) a conscious stance on study of actually existing social relations in contrast to the utopian constructing of an ideal social system; (3) reliance on empirical methods of research (although the understanding of these methods may differ) in contrast to speculative philosophical constructs.

The elements of this approach were built up gradually within the context of social philosophy and the philosophy of the history of modern times, and as empirical studies and the differentiation of social and humanitarian sciences developed (the process being strongly affected, moreover, by a powerful flow to the social sciences from the natural sciences).

The problem of society as a system had already been posed by seventeenth-century theories of 'social physics'. Insofar as society was represented as part of nature, social science became methodologically a part of natural science. While the stellar world was depicted in these theories as a mechanical interaction of celestial bodies, society was regarded as a kind of astronomical system of individuals connected by social attraction and repulsion.

The 'natural theory of society' was rationalistic. Its aim was not to describe social facts but to reduce them to a small number of general laws immanent in nature (including the nature of man) the validity of which raised no doubts. The thinkers of the seventeenth century, having taken mathematics (geometric method), astronomy, and mechanics, as the model of science, endeavoured to make broad, deductive constructs, and treated not only history scornfully but also social statistics (which was making its first significant advances at that time).

The social philosophy of the eighteenth century, which was orientated to Newtonian physics rather than to astronomy and geometry, was already not so mechanistic and was more careful about its generalisations.

Mediaeval philosophy and its ideological heirs (Romantic traditionalists) represented society as an organic whole, as a community in which socio-economic ties were inseparable from moral ones and were personified and hallowed by traditions and religion. The Enlighteners counterposed to that idealised image of mediaeval 'communalness' a 'mechanistic' model of society based on division of labour and rational exchange between individuals. The likening of society to a machine that constituted a kind of structural equivalent of philosophical-historical Crusoism was naïve and in the final analysis idealist. But it opened up a possibility of analytical singling out and clarification of the real functions of separate social institutions and subsystems (the state, law, the economy, culture) which had hardly been differentiated in the 'organic' model.

The difference between society and the state was first of all clarified. The first step toward that had already been made by the theorists of 'natural law' and of the contract origin of the state. For all the idealist character of their views the delimitation of the 'natural' social structure and 'artificial' legal estab-

lishments opened the way to understanding of the nondependence of business and economic affairs on politics.

The English materialists of the seventeenth century (Thomas Hobbes, John Locke), the Scottish moralists (David Hume, Adam Smith, Adam Ferguson), and the French materialists of the eighteenth century (Holbach, Helvetius) were in accord in considering human behaviour as egoistic in principle, directed to attaining some personal advantage. But it was only a step from reducing the motives of the social behaviour of the individual or group to the interests of the latter to establishing the dependence of those interests on the individual's or group's real socio-economic position. The thesis of the clash of social interests led logically to a conclusion about the non-correlativity or incompatibility of the conscious motives of individual actions and their social results. The Scottish moralists stressed that people's social behaviour, not to mention its results, was decisively governed by irrational, instinctive forces and inclinations, and that people's deeds, while interweaving and clashing, generated results quite indeterminate and unexpected for all the parties of this interaction. From that it followed that the structure and dynamics of the social whole could be explained without their being correlated with the consciousness of the individuals comprising this whole, politicians included. As a result the postulate of a "social contract", necessary for awareness of the human (and not divine) nature of authority, itself became superfluous and was subjected to sharp criticism.

The Physiocrats, thanks to whom "political economy... was raised to the rank of a special science",[2] started consciously from the principle of the autonomy of economic affairs as regards law, suggesting that the spontaneous play of economic forces led more truly and surely to socially useful results than administrative, bureaucratic measures.

Clarification of the significance of economic property relations led social thought, beginning with Jean Jacques Rousseau, to the problem of class differences and the functional role of social inequality. The English classical economists deduced the social division of society from the social division of labour. This led, at the end of the eighteenth century, to the concept 'class' coming into use, which did not coincide with the concept 'estate' in use until then. Augustin Thierry, the French historian

of the Restoration period, made the concept of class struggle popular. Although the new terms did not yet have the strict meaning they have received in Marxism, they clearly implied a new social structure based primarily on property differences rather than on mediaeval estates.

The 'real' world of spontaneously shaped social relations came to be called civil society in contrast to the world of political and legal relations. That was linked terminologically with the traditional difference between civil (private) law and public law. But Hegel had already examined this matter more deeply, seeing civil society as simultaneously united (since no individual could get along in such a society without others), and divided, torn by contradictory selfish interests. And since he stressed that civil society was not always sharply counterposed everywhere to political society proper, but only in 'modern' epoch, the term also acquired a historical sense signifying, on the one hand, a certain *sphere*, a part of the social whole, and, on the other hand, capitalist society as a *stage* of historical development.

The attempt made by Vico at a conceptual delimitation of society and culture, and the Enlighteners' development of the idea of progress were very important achievements of eighteenth-century philosophy.

The Enlighteners' theory of progress, which played the role of the ideological foundation of the capitalist, bourgeois epoch, largely paved the way for the evolutionist schemes of the nineteenth century. But the linear conception of social development often took on a frankly teleological character: the goal postulated by the philosopher in fact played the role of the Providence. In addition, the establishing of profound social changes was harmonised at every step with the principle of the invariance of 'human nature', treated in an anthropological spirit.

In its application to *historical* material the idea of 'eternal, immutable' laws was very shaky. Attempts to explain both the general *structure* of society, and its concrete *state* at a certain moment of time, by one and the same formula, inevitably failed, while the identification of the concepts of social change, development, and progress created an illusion of the movement of history along a predetermined route.

Thus, although the social philosophy of modern times de-

veloped important theoretical problems, its constructs proved to be speculative and unspecific. But, parallel with the speculative philosophy of history in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, empirical social studies began to develop, above all social statistics. These investigations, arising from the practical needs of government, were originally local, imperfect in methods, and different in various countries.[3] But they gradually gathered scope and force. In France the technique of mass statistical surveys and economic censuses was developed. The English 'political arithmeticians' of the seventeenth century, William Petty, John Graunt, Gregory King, and Edmund Halley, laid the foundations of modern demography and worked out methods of quantitative investigation of social patterns.

Looked at separately, the empirical studies of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries seem only descriptive, without a general theoretical basis. But in default of a sociological theory these investigations were based on the conceptions of natural science and general philosophy. It is characteristic that there were many outstanding natural scientists among the founders of empirical sociology (for example, Halley, Laplace, Buffon, and Lavoisier), whose study of social processes was organically linked with their scientific activity.

These scientists did not simply 'apply' the ready-made methods developed in the natural sciences to the study of social problems; many general scientific methods and theories were developed in fact on social material. Laplace's *Essai philosophique sur les probabilités* (1814), for instance, was largely the result of a socio-demographic study by himself and his colleagues. A desire to get a rigorous mathematical formula of population growth explains the popularity of Malthus' *Essay on Population* (1798) to no small extent, in spite of the clearly reactionary character and unsoundness of his theory.

In addition to social statistics the development of ethnographic studies at the end of the eighteenth and in the early nineteenth centuries had great significance for sociology. The 'savage world' discovered by the first historians, travellers, and settlers was not so much just an object of study as an object of influence. But the Enlighteners' theories about 'natural man' stimulated a more and more active comparison of 'civilised morals' and 'savage'; the savage was now primitive man in whom

Europeans could recognise features of their own history.

In the middle of the eighteenth century the word 'anthropology' still belonged to the lexicon of anatomy and meant 'study of the human body'. But Buffon was already defining it as the general science of human kind (including linguistics, study of cultures, etc., in it).

The first attempts at a *systematic* description and comparison of the ways of life of various nations (often with a historical twist) were made in the eighteenth century (Joseph Lafitau, François de Volney). Speculative philosophical constructs continually clashed as a result with checked and recorded scientific facts that indicated the complexity of the problem of the unity and diversity of human culture.

The comparative historical method was being applied not only to study of 'primitive' peoples but also to jurisprudence, folklore, and linguistics.

In the early nineteenth century speculative social philosophy was everywhere being counterposed by the idea of scientific 'positive' investigation. The differentiating and 'hiving off' of scientific disciplines itself was also accelerated. Hard on the heels of jurisprudence and history, political economy, ethnography, statistics, and linguistics were separated off from philosophy. That was a model and precedent for the rise of new disciplines, and at the same time increased the need for some new intellectual synthesis and a generalising, but at the same time non-philosophical (in the sense of non-speculative) science of man and society.

2. The Social and Class Premisses of Sociology

The birth of sociology was also linked with certain social needs. Just as the social philosophy of the Enlighteners reflected the breaking-up of the feudal order and the rise of a new, capitalist society (which it anticipated in many ways), sociology arose as a reflection of the inner antagonisms of capitalist society and the social and political struggles generated by it.

The early nineteenth century was a period not only of stormy growth of capitalism, but also of the first clear display of its contradictions. The growth of industry and of towns was

accompanied with mass ruin of the peasantry, handicraftsmen and artisans, and of small property owners. The extremely hard conditions of factory work and of the workers' life contrasted sharply with the growth of the bourgeoisie's wealth, provoking a sharpening of class struggle. The uprising of the Lyon weavers in France, the Luddite movement in England, and later Chartism, were evidence of the entry into the arena of a new social class, the proletariat. Disillusionment with the results of the bourgeois revolution and the 'Kingdom of Reason' proclaimed by it swept broad strata of the intellectuals. The lost illusions were succeeded by bitter scepticism; the need for a realistic analysis and evaluation of existing society, and of its past, present, and future, was intensified.

The mode of that analysis depended on the thinker's class position. In the first third of the nineteenth century, three main orientations, and correspondingly three groups of thinkers, became clearly outlined in the socio-political thought of Western Europe: conservative traditionalists, bourgeois liberal utilitarians, and utopian socialists, who not only embodied different intellectual traditions but also expressed the interests of different social classes.

The conservative traditionalists (also called reactionary romantics), like Edmund Burke (1729-1797), Louis de Bonald (1754-1840), and Joseph de Maistre (1754-1821), held a frankly negative position in regard to the French Revolution of 1789 and its results. They associated the post-revolutionary development with chaos and destruction, which they counterposed to an idealised harmony and order of the feudal Middle Ages and prerevolutionary times. Hence their polemic against the ideas of the Enlightenment and the specific theory of society.[4]

In opposition to the individualism and social nominalism of the Enlightenment, which treated society as the result of interactions between individuals, the traditionalists regarded society as an organic whole with its own internal laws rooted in its remote past. Society not only preceded the individual historically, but also stood above him morally. Man's existence was impossible in principle without society, which moulded him, in the direct sense of the term, only for its own ends. Society did not consist of individuals but of relations and institutions in which each person was allotted a certain function

or role. Since all parts of this whole were organically interconnected and interdependent, a change in any of them inevitably disturbed the stability of the whole social system.

Satisfaction of fundamental, immutable human needs underlay the functions of social institutions. Disruption or weakening of the activity of any social institution therefore inevitably caused a disordering and disorganisation of the corresponding functions. It proved nothing that the social function of any institution or belief was harmful. Even prejudices sometimes performed a useful social role, uniting a group and strengthening its members' sense of safety and reliability. It was specially necessary for the stability of society to maintain those groups and institutions by which the individual was linked with other people and with society as a whole. Urbanisation, industrialisation, and commerce, which were undermining these traditional foundations of social being, did not lead to a higher form of social organisation but to social and moral disintegration.

The reactionary ideological sense of that conception, which retrospectively justified and substantiated any 'historical' determinations, is obvious. But it is also indisputable that the traditionalists anticipated many later sociological conceptions aimed at bringing out the inner relationships of the social whole.

Whereas the traditionalists regarded society as an organic whole that had to be understood in order to adapt to it better, the liberals saw in it an 'artificial body', a more or less mechanical aggregate of parts that could be altered and improved by people's conscious activity. Priority was definitely given to the individual methodologically, if not ontologically. Methodological individualism was closely linked with a programme of *laissez-faire*, directed against guild and sectional regulation and regimentation, and feudal, bureaucratic arbitrariness, etc. The existence of any social institution was justified solely by its usefulness.

But what benefit precisely should be made the cornerstone of the appraisal of social institutions? The benefit of society? Or of the separate individual? Or of certain definite social groups and classes? While the bourgeoisie was a revolutionary class and objectively expressed the interests of the majority of the population, these questions were not so urgent. Holbach and Helvetius could still suggest that personal interest correctly

understood automatically included concern for the social whole. But English authors, who were more closely observing the establishing and development of capitalist relations, had already seen the contradictoriness of this development in the eighteenth century.

The further development of capitalism fostered a polarisation of scholars' class positions. In the theories of the English utilitarians, Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832) and James Mill (1773-1836), social interest was wholly reduced to the sum total of private interests; 'the bourgeoisie is no longer presented as a special class, but as the class whose conditions of existence are those of the whole society'.[5] Society, for Bentham, was a fictitious body made up of individuals who were regarded as its constituent members. While putting forward the principle of achieving the maximum good for the greatest number as a general ethical law, he at the same time considered socially normal and morally acceptable when people strove to achieve their own private interests, even when that did harm to others. The utilitarian doctrine was converted

> into a mere apologia for the existing state of affairs, an attempt to prove that under existing conditions the mutual relations of people today are the most advantageous and generally useful.[6]

While recognising the possibility of partial improvement and reform of the existing society, bourgeois liberalism resolutely opposed every kind of innovation of a revolutionary character; and the idea of social evolution, from having been a means of condemning feudalism, became a means of justifying already victorious capitalism.

Social thinking did not develop just within the framework of bourgeois ideology. The utopian socialism of Saint-Simon, Fourier, and Robert Owen was also based on a definite social philosophy on whose banner were the demands of scientific character, sobriety, and positiveness. The works of Saint-Simon (1760-1825) were particularly important on that plane.

In his *Mémoire sur la science de l'homme* (Note on the Science of Man), 1813, which largely anticipated the path of development of social thought, Saint-Simon remarked that 'there has not been a science of man up to the present, only a

1147

conjectural science', and proposed to give it 'the stamp of the observational sciences',[7] to give 'the science of man a positive character by basing it on observations and by treating it by the method employed for other branches of physics'.[8] As a counterweight to speculative philosophical constructs he proposed 'to occupy himself in all parts of his work in establishing the series of facts, being persuaded that this is the only solid part of our knowledge'.[9]

But utopian socialism was incompatible in principle with scientific investigation.

> The Socialism of earlier days certainly criticised the existing capitalistic mode of production and its consequences. But it could not explain them, and, therefore, could not get the mastery of them. It could only simply reject them as bad [Frederick Engels wrote]. The more strongly this earlier socialism denounced the exploitation of the working class, inevitable under capitalism, the less able was it clearly to show in what this exploitation consisted and how it arose.[10]

The real revolution in the science of society, which laid the foundation of scientific sociology, was made by Marx and Engels.

> Just as Darwin put an end to the view of animal and plant species being unconnected, fortuitous, 'created by God' and immutable, and was the first to put biology on an absolutely scientific basis by establishing the mutability and the succession of species, so Marx put an end to the view of society being a mechanical aggregation of individuals which allows of all sorts of modification at the will of the authorities (or, if you like, at the will of society and the government) and which emerges and changes casually, and was the first to put sociology on a scientific basis by establishing the concept of the economic formation of society as the sum-total of given production relations, by establishing the fact that the development of such formations is a process of natural history.[11]

The similarity of the theories of Marx and Darwin noted by Lenin consisted in their both being, on the one hand, theories of the *historical* development of nature and society and, on the

other, theories of the *functioning of systems*.

The materialist understanding of history was hostile, right from the start, to speculative, history-of-philosophy constructs; it developed in very close connection with study of concrete social processes and of the history of society. 'We wish to construct our exposition solely on *factual material*, endeavouring, as far as we can, to present only facts in a general form,' Marx wrote.[12] But purely descriptive investigations satisfied him just as little as abstract metaphysics.

> Crass empiricism turns into false metaphysics, scholasticism, which toils painfully to deduce undeniable empirical phenomena by simple formal abstraction directly from the general law, or to show by cunning argument that they are in accordance with that law [he wrote].[13]

While rejecting the reification of 'social forces' and 'essences' typical of idealist philosophy, Marx stressed that people were at once actors and authors of their world-historical drama, and that the structure of society coincided in that sense with the structure of their joint, combined activity. But these were not the abstract individuals, taken separately, who figured in the *Robinson Crusoes* of the eighteenth century, but individuals who found themselves in a definite, historically concrete system of social relations.

The understanding of society as a whole, law-governed, inwardly connected system entails the principle of *objective* scientific investigation:

> Its task [Engels wrote] was no longer to manufacture a system of society as perfect as possible, but to examine the historico-economic succession of events from which these classes and their antagonism had of necessity sprung, and to discover in the economic conditions thus created the means of ending the conflict.[14]

But in opposition to the traditionalist and positivist kowtowing to 'facts', including the 'wholeness' of the social system, Marx initially fixed its inner contradictions. The stability of a social system described in structural terms was only a moment in a more general process of historical development. Any systems model of society required historical concretisation, and it was impossible to understand the laws of the development

and functioning of a specific society, 'by using as one's master key a general historico-philosophical theory, the supreme virtue of which consists in being supra-historical'.[15]

While stressing the leading role of material production in the development of society, Marx was, at the same time, far from a theory of social automatism. It was not simply a matter of recognising the 'feedback' of ideas on the economy; in deducing the social division of society and its class structure from the economy, above all from property relations, Marx showed that this determination was ambiguous, and that different potentials of development were inherent in one and the same society and were displayed in the interests of different social classes and realised in their activity. Recognition of class struggle as the driving force of history took sociological theory out of the framework of structural-functional relations between separate social institutions and standards, and brought to the fore the problem of the *subject of social action*, and evaluation of its real opportunities. Sociology thus became an element and the theoretical foundation of scientific socialism.

Lenin, calling the materialist understanding of history 'a synonym for social science',[16] wrote that 'this hypothesis for the first time made a *scientific* sociology possible'.[17] The principles of the materialist conception of history were brilliantly applied by Marx and Engels to investigation of capitalist society as a whole, and to a number of partial social objects. 'Now,' Lenin wrote, 'since the appearance of *Capital*—the materialist conception of history is no longer a hypothesis, but a scientifically proven proposition.'[18]

Separate aspects of Marx's and Engels' sociological conception were developed further and concretised in the works of Plekhanov, August Bebel, the early Kautsky, and Labriola. And Lenin made a colossal contribution to a Marxist sociology.

Both the theoretical-methodological and ideological principles of Marxian sociology were unacceptable to the ideologists of the capitalist class. At the same time the dominant class needed a certain dose of sociological realism so as to explain social processes, and concrete empirical information on various aspects of social life, since it would otherwise become increasingly difficult to govern society. But the sociological theories that the bourgeoisie needed had to be such as not to threaten

the foundations of the capitalist order. Sociology was created as an *alternative* to socialism. Positivism became its philosophical and methodological basis.

Notes

[1] V. I. Lenin. What the 'Friends of the People' Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats. *Collected Works*, Vol. 1 (Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1986), p 165.

[2] Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. *The German Ideology* (Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1976), p 436.

[3] Bernard Lécuyer and Anthony R. Oberschall. The Early History of Social Research. In: *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* (David L. Sills, Editor), Vol. 15 (The Macmillan Co., and The Free Press, New York, 1968), pp 36-53.

[4] For more details see: Irving M. Zeitlin. *Ideology and the Development of Sociological Theory* (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., 1968), pp 54-55.

[5] Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. *Op.cit.*, p 437.

[6] *Ibid.*, pp 437-438.

[7] *Oeuvres choisies de C.-H. de Saint-Simon* (Van Meenen et C^ie, Brussels, 1859), p 100.

[8] *Ibid.*, p 144.

[9] *Ibid.*, p 18.

[10] Frederick Engels. *Socialism: Utopian and Scientific* (Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1978), p 57.

[11] V. I. Lenin. *Op.cit.*, p 142.

[12] Karl Marx. Justification of the Correspondent from the Mosel. In: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. *Collected Works*, Vol. 1 (Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1986), p 343.

[13] Karl Marx. *Theories of Surplus-Value*, Part I (Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1978), p 89.

[14] Frederick Engels. *Op.cit.*, p 132.

[15] Marx to the Editorial Board of the *Otechestvenniye Zapiski*. In: K. Marx, F. Engels,. *Selected Correspondence* (Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1982), p 294.

[16] V. I. Lenin. *Op.cit.*, p 142.

[17] *Ibid.*, p 140.

[18] *Ibid.* p 142.

2

AUGUSTE COMTE AND THE ORIGIN OF POSITIVIST SOCIOLOGY

Yelena Osipova

1. Comte and His Time

Auguste Comte, the founder of positivism in philosophy and sociology, was born in Montpellier in 1798 in the family of a civil servant. The first half of the nineteenth century was an extremely important period in the history of France. The rapid development of capitalism and the moulding of a new class structure of society were accompanied with frequent changes of the forms of political power. The Directory, the Consulate, the Empire, the Restoration, the Revolution of 1830, the July Monarchy, the Revolution of 1848, the Second Republic, and the Second Empire were the main political milestones of the period. Parallel with growth of the bourgeoisie's wealth and power, the poverty and strength of resistance of the working class also grew. The development of science and engineering was combined with a crisis of the traditional ideological systems and intense philosophical quests.

All that had its effect on Comte's outlook. Early abandoning the Catholicism and monarchism of his father's family, he developed an agnostic stance on traditional religion. His education in science, received in the Ecole polytechnique in Paris, and republican sympathies opposed both to Napoleon and the Bourbons, conditioned the character of his theoretical views. Expelled from the Ecole as a free-thinker, he became a tutor in mathematics. His first small works were devoted to mathemat-

ical matters. While studying the works of important French mathematicians of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries like Louis Lagrange and Gaspard Monge, he became familiar with the problematic of the philosophy of science. Montesquieu and Condorcet, out of the broad range of authors whose works the young Comte read, had a special influence on him: the former by his affirmation of the dependence of political and legal phenomena on natural laws, and the latter by his formulation of the law of mankind's progressive development and his conception of history in which the evolution of social ideas, institutions, and relations had a main place. While having a lively interest in political economy, Comte was critical of the doctrines of bourgeois liberal economists who preached freedom of competition, which should, in their view, bring about social harmony of free and independent individuals. He opposed to these doctrines the idea of social unity and the political integration of individuals and classes, basing himself on the conceptions of the traditionalists and their treatment of social order.

In 1817-1824 Comte worked as Saint-Simon's secretary, and was undoubtedly receptive of many of his ideas. But the disagreements between them on root theoretical and political matters led to a breach. Saint-Simon's ideas about class struggle of exploiters and producers, and his high appreciation of the role of labour remained incomprehensible and unacceptable to Comte. Whereas Saint-Simon spoke of a society of free and equal producers, Comte propagandised a centralised state with a hierarchical structure. While Saint-Simon put the idea of social progress in the foreground, Comte stressed the importance of social statics. His system of positive philosophy, although it contained elements resembling Saint-Simon's conception, was based on quite other ideological and theoretical foundations. His six-volume *Cours de philosophie positive*,[1] published between 1839 and 1842, developed the principles of the classification of sciences, positive philosophy, and sociology. His second work was devoted to the foundations of the politics and religion of the future. This was *Le système de politique positive ou Traité de sociologie*[2] published in four volumes (1851-1854). During his lifetime he also published his *Traité d'astronomie populaire* (1845), *Discours sur l'ensemble de positivisme* (1848), *Catéchisme positiviste* (1852), *Appel aux*

Conservateurs (1855), and *Synthèse subjective* (1856).

Giving lectures for workers at the Polytechnical Society Comte made personal contacts with them, and in 1848 organised the Positivist Society on the basis of this group of the audience, and students drawn to him; the aims of the society were education of the people in the spirit of the positivist outlook on the world. At the same time he and his supporters sharply opposed the revolutionary actions of the Parisian proletariat. Not getting support, in the conditions of the revolutionary situation, from either of the belligerent parties, Comte found himself completely isolated. His appeal to the intellectual elite to found a party of order and progress was also not crowned with success. He died in 1857, lonely, neglected, and thought to be a madman.

Despite the seeming contradiction between the first and second periods of his work, they were based on one and the same ideas and premisses. Ideas of the moral unity of mankind, and of the reorganisation of society on the basis of a new 'religion', positivism, which was at the same time a theory of social science, ran through all his works. He considered the functions of the social science he strove to create, and of the new 'religion', to be identical, suggesting that there could be a 'true', 'scientific' religion or, which was the same thing, a moral science that performed the religious functions of social integration. Hence one of the paradoxes characteristic of his views.

2. The Classification of the Sciences

The separation of the sciences from metaphysics and theology was the main idea of Comte's positive method.[3] In his opinion true science was characterised by renouncing 'unanswerable' questions, i.e., ones that could not be confirmed or refuted, relying on facts established by observation. He considered questions of the essence and causes of things to be such 'metaphysical', unscientific matters. It was the task of science, according to him, to discover laws, understood as constant, repeated connections between phenomena. This limitation was due to a striving to gain precise, definite knowledge that could

provide a basis for predicting the future.[4]

Comte came forward as the abolisher of philosophy in the old traditional sense of the word. In his notions it had no special subject-matter of its own, nor a method different from those of science. The positive philosophy was a systematisation of sciences or the 'scientific in the sciences'. In order to expound the positive philosophy it was necessary to expound an all-embracing system of sciences that included analysis of their subject-matter, methods, laws, similarities and differences.

When developing his classification of sciences, Comte based himself on their objective attributes. First of all, he divided them into the abstract and the concrete. The former studied the laws of certain categories of phenomena, the latter applied these laws to partial fields. Biology, for example, was the general abstract science of life, and medicine a concrete science applying the general laws of biology. Comte distinguished five abstract, theoretical sciences: astronomy, physics, chemistry, biology, and sociology, and supplemented the main categories of natural phenomena (astronomical, physical, chemical, and biological) with the category of social phenomena, thus giving his classification the 'character of universality indispensable to its definitive constitution'.[5] His 'encyclopaedic ladder' was built on the principle of the growing complexity of the phenomena studied by the respective sciences. Social phenomena were distinguished by the greatest complexity and at the same time depended on all the others, which explained the later rise of sociology. Nevertheless these were natural phenomena governed by natural laws specific for the field. Comte first called the positive science of society social physics, but later sociology, explaining the need to introduce the new term not by a passion for neologisms but by the need to create a special discipline devoted to positive investigation of the fundamental laws proper to social phenomena. He stressed that sociology must be a theoretical discipline in contrast to the Adolphe Quételet's descriptive 'social physics'. The conversion of sociology into a positive science completed the system of positive philosophy, thus marking the onset of the positive stage of development of the human mind and human society. It meant, in Comte's view, a real 'positive revolution', the victory of science over the scholasticism of past epochs.

Comte's views on science corresponded to the metaphysical (antidialectical) method of thinking predominant in natural science in the first third of the nineteenth century. Natural science had not yet then provided convincing facts in favour of the idea of the development of nature, and put forward only separate brilliant guesses, that could not yet be converted into scientific theories. The metaphysical mode of thinking decided Comte's classifying the sciences as existing side by side, and not as arising from each other. He discovered only structural links between them, and not genetic ones; his classification was based on the principle of co-ordination, not of subordination.[6]

In spite of the general metaphysical character of his outlook on the world, there were certain elements of dialectical thinking in it all the same. While he denied the possibility of knowing separate facts isolated from one another, he insisted on their relations being investigated, and called for examination of their functioning in the context of the greater entities they formed part of. Thus, it was necessary, when investigating the activity of separate organs, to bear in mind the structure and properties of the organism as a whole, and to relate every phenomenon of social life with such wholes as the epoch, civilisation, and humanity.

The integral approach was Comte's main methodological postulate from which he criticised contemporaneous psychology and political economy. He considered the integral or whole (organism, society) more accessible to direct investigation than the phenomena functioning within it. And whereas the knowledge in sciences that studied inanimate nature was always relative, and could not be full, it could be much more complete in the biological and social sciences, since there were certain concrete wholes in them, amenable to study. Such an entity as humanity concerned man most of all; knowledge of it was most accessible to him, that is why it had attained the highest logical fulness and had become absolute.

Comte's positive method played a certain role in the struggle against *spiritualism*. His stressing of the great value of science, and demand for its autonomy, and his opposing it to official religion and metaphysical speculations had progressive significance as a protest against open idealism and clericalism. Many naturalists interpreted positivism in the spirit of natural-science

materialism. As an 'anti-philosophical' trend in philosophy that strove to rise 'above' the basic philosophical question and the struggle of the two principal trends in philosophy, positivism, by its appearance, marked a crisis of bourgeois spiritual culture and presaged its further deepening. But in Brazil, China, Japan, Poland, Russia, and Turkey, and other countries, the ideas of Comte, Spencer, Taine, and their disciples and interpreters were antidotes to religious mysticism, speculation, and loose methods of argument. Positivist evolutionism was sometimes misinterpreted in the spirit of materialism (I. M. Sechenov) or found an analogue in the form of certain scientific constructs (Thomas Huxley, Le Dantec, and others).

Comte's methodology united diverse trends. While it played a certain progressive role in its day, it later became more and more a brake on the development of science, since it was based on an untrue, historically limited interpretation of it. As the French historian of science, André Cresson put it: 'Science seems everywhere to show that Comte clipped its wings too much. It can do more than he thought and said'.[7]

3. The Subject-matter and Tasks of Sociology

Comte counterposed sociology as a positive science to theological and metaphysical speculations about society and man. On the one hand, he criticised theologians, who, by regarding man as a being different in principle from animals, considered him created by God or Providence. On the other hand, while criticising the philosophers who preceded him as 'metaphysicians' who created 'social utopias', he reproached them for understanding society as the creation of human reason and the rational will of individuals. Sociology, according to him, was the sole science that studied how man's reason and mind were improved by the influence of social life. This idea developed into a whole conception of the individual as an abstraction and of society as reality governed by natural laws. Social phenomena, unlike biological ones, were in a constant state of change and transformation, and developed in time. Their essence was historicity. Comte therefore had exceptional respect for Condorcet who had looked on society from a historical point of view.

While focussing attention on the natural, law-governed character of social phenomena, Comte opposed voluntarism and exaggeration of the role of 'great men', and pointed out the correspondence of a political regime to the level of development of civilisation. While not denying the role of the economic factor, he all the same considered civilisation primarily a spiritual, psychological community, a community of ideas. Ideas, he wrote, governed and overturned the world, and the whole mechanism rested ultimately on opinions.[8] The main content of social development and evolution was scientific thought, and the 'scientific spirit'.[9] His picture of the development of the history of society was built on that.

Comte's argument about sociology as a science, and about its subject-matter and range of problems, had a very abstract character. He outlined the field of sociological investigations very broadly and indefinitely; it included all investigations that did not come within the purview of the other sciences named in his classification. The principal, primary reality from which the investigator started was society taken in its integrity and wholeness. Comte understood by that the organic unity of all mankind or of any of its major parts, connected by a *consensus omnium*, characterised by a harmonious functioning of its structural elements. The extraordinary complexity of society was due to the contemporary factors operating in it being merged with historical ones, and to past generations influencing contemporary ones. Society, or as he began to call it, humanity, was the supreme reality (*sui generis*) and the supreme being.

One can see rudiments in Comte's views of what subsequently began to be called the systems approach to social life. But Comte did not understand the real dialectic of social elements and structures and treated the elements of social life as simple, eternal, and immutable, and social development as the result of various combinations of one and the same elements. His seminal ideas about the objectified products of human activity that could become the subject of the sociologist's study were drowned in a flood of general arguments about humanity as the supreme being. Comtean sociology was an idealist philosophy of history that included many metaphysical, speculative elements.

4. The Methods of Sociology

An essential part of Comtean sociology was the development of methods applicable to the study of society. While opposing speculation on the one hand, and the extremes of empiricism on the other, Comte substantiated the applicability in sociology of observation, and of experimental, comparative, and historical methods.

Observation, he said, was the main method of investigation in sociology. But he could not define what demands social observation should meet, so as to be considered reliable and exact. The observation of social facts should put sociology on the level of science, and give the material the sociologist worked with the character of objectivity. Empirical material should be analysed under the control of theory, otherwise the sociologist would achieve nothing except a conglomeration of a mass of isolated, haphazard facts that said nothing in themselves. 'It was obvious,' he wrote, 'that any social observations, either static or dynamic, should require the continual use of fundamental theories.'[10]

Absence of a positive theory relying on what one could gather and generalise the facts, was the main difficulty of sociology in Comte's opinion; it was consequently caught in a vicious circle since it needed a theory in order to make observations, and observations in order to create a theory.

Among the less important difficulties connected with observation Comte noted the complexity of getting the scientific training needed to free the investigator from obstacles of an unscientific character—prejudices, common opinions, etc. Here, too, a scientific theory that prevented speculation and provided the investigator with the needed concepts was a help.

Comte noted the great importance not only of direct observations but also of indirect evidence. Study of historical and cultural memorials, customs, and rituals, for example, and analysis and comparison of languages could give sociology continually useful means of positive exploration.[11]

Comte considered experiment the second method in importance of sociology. Direct experiment in sociology consisted in observing the changes of a phenomenon under the impact of

research conditions specially created for the purpose. Indirect or mediated experiment he understood as investigation of pathological deviations of society, deviations that arose through social upheavals, mainly of a revolutionary character. Social perturbations that shook the social organism were similar, in his opinion, to the illnesses of the individual organism. They clearly revealed the social organism's fundamental laws, since the illness made it possible to discern the normal better.

A third method of the positive sciences also applicable in sociology was the comparative one by which the life of peoples living in the same time in various parts of the world were compared so as to establish general laws of the existence and development of societies.

In Comte's view comparisons of animal societies with human ones, so as to show their similarities and differences, could also be useful. Finally, one could compare the social position of the various classes of one and the same society, but a conclusion about how far they were influenced by the main phases of development of civilisation was obscured by the influence of the general spirit of the times, which smoothed out differences.

The weakness of the comparative method, in Comte's view, was that it did not show the sequence of social states, but represented them as co-existing. That could create an incorrect notion of the stages of evolution. The comparative method could therefore only be successfully employed if it were governed by a definite theory of the development of humanity.

The specific method of sociology most corresponding to the nature of social phenomena, Comte considered to be the historical, i.e., the method of historical comparisons of various consecutive states of humanity.[12] Only by comparing a whole series of social phenomena taken in their sequence, could the scientist note the growth of some physical, intellectual, moral, or political feature or tendency, and the corresponding weakening of the opposite tendency, and on that basis scientifically predict the final result, provided that it fully conformed to the system of the general laws of human development.[13]

Such a peculiarity of sociology as the necessity to proceed habitually from the general effect to the parts was best expressed in the historical method.[14] According to Comte there was no difference between history and sociology, which he

sometimes called the political science.[15] Comte considered the predominance of the historical point of view a sign of the times and at once the essential principle and general result of positivism.[16]

Discussion of the methods of sociology belongs to the most rational part of Comte's system. He started from a thesis about the existence of natural laws of social life, discovery of which would make it possible to create a science of society. He did not, moreover, deny the uniqueness of society compared with nature, and looked for specific methods of investigating it. The fruitfulness of the idea of the natural-history character of social patterns was particularly obvious when one remembers that theological and spiritualist conceptions that denied the possibility of scientific knowledge of society were predominant at that time. The posing of the question of the need to rely on a firm theoretical foundation for carrying out sociological research was also important. It was Comte's misfortune that he could not propose anything as this foundation except his theories of social statics and dynamics, the laws of which had a speculative, abstract character that in no way corresponded to his own initial precepts.

5. Social Statics

Comte divided sociology into two major sections, social statics and social dynamics. The first studied the conditions of existence and laws of the functioning of a social system, the latter the laws of the development and change of social systems. Social statics was a theory of social order, organisation, and harmony. Comte regarded society as an organic whole all of whose parts were interconnected and could be understood only in unity. That conception was aimed directly against individualistic theories and attempts to regard society as the product of a contract between individuals. Exploration of the principles that determined the structure of society, and guaranteed harmony and order, was inseverably connected, for Comte, with the social policy, which could realise them. He treated the main social institutions (the family, state, and religion) from the standpoint primarily of their social functions and their role in

social integration. His reasoning was thus coloured by conservative tones, and he painted the future in the form of a romantically idealised past.

Comte defined family relations as a moral and emotional union based on attraction and mutual sympathy. The role of the family was to mediate between the individual and the kin, to bring up the young generation in a spirit of altruism, and to teach it to overcome innate selfishness. The family figured with him as either a spontaneous source of our moral education or as the natural basis of our political organisation. In its first aspect each family of the present time prepared the society of the future; in its second aspect a new family extended present society.[17]

When examining the main family relations, i.e., those between the sexes and between the generations, he did not deny the historical variability of the family. But he argued essentially about the contemporaneous bourgeois family, idealising it, and not linking analysis of it with problems of property, inheritance, money, etc. He expressed himself sharply, in a patriarchal spirit, against women's equality, and everywhere stressed the need to consolidate the authority and power of the male—father and husband. Women, in his view, were beneath men intellectually, and were inferior to them in will power. Woman's social role was determined by her emotional and moral qualities, her capacity to unite people and to educate them morally. It was the task of women to exert an elevating influence on coarse male natures, and to awaken social feelings in them, based on solidarity. So the positive theory of the human family came down to systematising the spontaneous influence of feminine sentiment on masculine activity.[18]

Women's role in the upbringing of the rising generation was just as great. The family was the guardian and transmitter of traditions and of the experience of past generations. In the family the individual was socialised and acquired qualities needed for successful service to mankind, got rid of natural individualism, and learned to live for others. Good relations between the generations maintained equilibrium and the balance between traditions and innovation, whose bearers were the old and the young.

Co-operation, based on division of labour, was an analogue

of family relations on the broader social plane. In it each did that to which he was most inclined; all were interested in one another. So the *consensus universalis* arose and the spontaneous interaction of individuals.

By stressing the significance of emotional and moral ties, and putting the accent on the element of consensus, Comte pushed economic relations and connections into the background, although he did not deny their importance. He considered the principle of *laissez-faire* absurd, as promoting display of the worst, selfish sides of human nature. Social harmony could not be established where competition and exploitation prevailed.[19]

Comte also saw the negative aspects of the division of labour. It promoted development of the capacities of each and suppressed general aptitudes; specialisation narrowed a person's outlook; social feelings united only persons of the same vocations, creating hostility to other professions and trades, etc.[20] Excessive division of labour could lead to the breaking down of society into separate corporations, disrupting its unity, generating competition, and arousing the basest instincts.

From his stating that there was a tendency toward the dissolution of society and disruption of its organic unity, Comte deduced the need for the political power of government as expressed of the 'general spirit'. The social purpose of government, according to him, was to prevent as far as possible this fatal tendency to a fundamental scattering of ideas, feelings, and interests, an inevitable result of the principle of human development, and which, if it were able to pursue its natural course, would inevitably end by stopping social progress in all important respects.[21] The state was thus an agent of social solidarity and submission to it was the sacred duty of the individual. The guardian of social order, the state, performed economic, political, and moral functions, the last of which Comte considered to be the chief one. When demonstrating the necessity of a division of moral and political power to prevent intellectual and moral terror, which could hold back the development of thought and subordinate it to the narrow practical interests of rulers, Comte gave a high appreciation of the Middle Ages for the division of authority that existed then between state and Church. When lauding in every way the value and merit

of the spiritual dictatorship exercised by the mediaeval Church, he saw an analogue of it in positivism as a set of ideas, principles, and conceptions supplemented by a kind of cult—a series of civil rites and rituals meant to replace the old, traditional Church rituals.

The working out of the problems of spiritual life, the slogan of 'live for others', and his ethic of responsibilities did not attract many supporters. Comte could not correctly pose, let alone decide, the most important social problems. He idealistically underestimated the role of economic relations and exaggerated the role of spiritual ones. He regarded the division of labour not so much as an economic institution, as a kind of moral and psychological relation, without correlating it with a certain level of development of the productive forces, and furthermore with the character of the relations of production. He treated the formation of social groups, above all of vocational ones, abstractly, without deducing them from property relations. From that logically stemmed his justification and recognition of the need of the existing social structure.

6. Social Dynamics

Comte said that study of the dynamics of humanity's collective life necessarily constituted the positive theory of social progress.[22] By consciously abstracting himself from the diversity of the concrete forms of historical development, he created a scheme based on examples taken from the history of the 'most civilised' European nations. According to him progress meant development along an ascending line, although, in trying to free the concept of progress from ties with 'metaphysical values', he stressed that it included simple development without any sense of perfecting or improvement. Science, he wrote, could not answer whether social progress was also moral progress, although he himself was convinced that it was.

When sorting out the role of the various factors that influence social development, Comte divided them into primary and secondary. The primary, decisive factor was spiritual, mental development. He classed climate, race, life expectancy, growth of population, which conditioned the division of labour and

stimulated development of man's intellectual and moral features, as secondary. The secondary factors could only accelerate or slow down society's progress, which occurred in a regular way and could not be altered.

By subdividing progress into the material (improvement of external living conditions), the physical (the perfecting of human nature), the intellectual (the development of intellect, the transition from a religious and metaphysical outlook on the world to a positive one), and the moral (development of collectivism and of moral feelings), Comte attached special significance to the last two. The social organism, he wrote, was based on an aggregate of views, 'opinions', which while gradually changed affected all other aspects of social life. That being the case, social dynamics should be based on the history of the human spirit.

The most general abstract concepts were the most important indicators for him of the development of reason; the degree of development of society could therefore be judged by the corresponding philosophical systems. For each stage in the development of human reason, which proceeded regularly through three main stages (theological, metaphysical, and positive), there corresponded definite forms of art, economy, politics, and social organisation.

The law of three stages, the cornerstone of Comte's social dynamics was at once a historical and a logical law; the three stages of the development of the human mind corresponded to three similar stages of the development of history.

Comte divided the theological or fictitious stage, which embraced antiquity and the early Middle Ages (to 1300), into three periods: fetishism, polytheism, and monotheism. During fetishism people ascribed life to external objects and saw gods in them. During polytheism, which was most widespread in Greece and Rome, 'fictitious beings', by whose intervention all phenomena were explained, were endowed with life. A 'poetical world outlook' was created that encouraged development of artistic creation but was incapable of guiding practice. And he saw in that the reason for the weak development of material culture in antiquity.

The epoch of monotheism was the age of Christianity. The religion of one god altered the image of the world, political

and social relations, customs, and morality. Comte described at length the allegedly unusual harmony between the mediaeval state and religion, and considered Catholicism the author of that 'precious creation of humanity's political genius'.[23] The model of certain social institutions should be sought precisely in the Middle Ages.

The metaphysical stage, embracing 1300 to 1800, seemed to Comte to be a transitional period in which disruption of the old beliefs, the foundation of social order, was characteristic. The Reformation, the philosophy of the Enlightenment, revolutions ('the political triumph of the metaphysicians and legists'[24]) were the most important events of that time. 'Negative' critical philosophy led to the decline of all authority, of the power of the ruling classes, and of religion. But revolution (in Comte's opinion), while emancipating the individual and oppressed classes, did not create a doctrine that could unite minds. The conceptions of the French revolutionaries, he considered, were based on ignorance of history and its laws. Striving for revolutionary changes meant going against the laws of history, disrupting its regular course, plunging society into a morbid state, and so on. The 'metaphysical spirit' born in that period, sanctioned philosophical doubts, moral turpitude, and political disorder. Contemporaneous society, sunk into anarchy, was experiencing a need for a new ideology to replace the false, fictitious doctrines and perform an integrating social role.

Evidence that society was gradually entering the final, positive era was the spread of the sciences, growth of their social significance, and creation of the theory of positivism. The industrial system was replacing the military one characteristic of the theological epoch. The use of scientific discoveries for the good of all humanity guaranteed harmonious, equal development of all the elements of life. Characteristic features of the positive epoch were the victory of altruism over selfishness, growth of social feelings, and rapid development of material culture, which ensured an easier, more pleasant life for all, justice, and peace.

Compared with certain contemporary and preceding historical and philosophical-sociological works, Comte's social dynamics was not without certain merits. He tried to bring out the pattern of social evolution, which voluntarist historians had not

noticed. He opposed a historical approach to theories of natural law and social contract, and the point of view of society as a whole to liberal individualism. His historico-evolutionary approach to religion was also fruitful; he linked the development of religion with a broad range of socio-political relations, although he deduced the unity of society and the link between certain forms of religion and socio-political organisation from a community of ideas rather than from economic structure.

But, having based his social dynamics on the law of three stages, Comte refrained from analysing the diversity of the concrete forms of nations' historical development, adducing as illustrations only facts that supported the scheme he had constructed. His theory of social development was no more than a metaphysical, speculative scheme. He could not define either the true specifics of social life or the driving forces of history, let alone the direction of society's future development.[25]

7. The Positive Polity

The fundamental weakness of Comte's theory became particularly obvious when he passed from the general theses of social dynamics to substantiation of his positive programme, 'social polity'. He attached great significance to that part of his work. In contrast to the objective method aimed at discovering truth, the core of the positive polity should be subjective values and human interests and ideals. Accordingly he preached a subjective method in politics. One of his works, he said (having in mind *The Positive Philosophy*) had drawn a philosophy from science, while the other (*The System of Positive Polity*) had converted into a complete, definitive religion.[26]

In this new religion the place of God was taken by society, which the individual should recognise as the Supreme Being to which he owed everything.

As the 'religion of humanity' positivism preached the complete submergence of the individual in society, universal love, and brotherhood. Comte deduced the great social role of scientists and artists from the idea of the unity of emotions and reason; they would be the new priests, the guardians of positivist dogmas, and the custodians of the new cult. The idea of a

positivist church was also not alien to him; its aim was to be an association initially of co-religionists, and later of the people of the whole world. The positivist federation of nations with headquarters in Paris was to have the purpose of ensuring lasting peace on Earth.

Comte attached great importance to the proletariat in his discussion of this vague programme. 'Our proletarians,' he wrote, 'alone are capable of becoming the auxiliaries of the new philosophers.'[27] But to be that they had to break completely with socialist doctrines that infringed the institution of property (which positivists considered sacred). He sharply opposed the idea of communism and the thesis that the regulation of human activity depended on the mode of ownership.[28] In the positivist society property was to be treated as the accumulation of social wealth, and people who knew how to create and multiply property as servants of humanity. Comte put forward a vague idea of an industrial patriciate made up of industrialists and technicians, from whom three dictators (the triumvirate) were to be chosen to direct the affairs of industry, agriculture, and finance, concentrating legislative and executive power wholly in their hands. Moral authority was to be separated from political and economic administration, and to be in the hands of people specially appointed to exercise it, viz., philosophers and artists.

Comte's 'systematic socialism', which he counterposed to the 'spontaneous socialism' of the workers, was in fact a very vague, petty-bourgeois utopia.

Prolix arguments about universal love, order, and progress covered the reactionary political sense of the idea of the corporate system in which spiritual authority was concentrated in a caste of philosophers, material possibilities and power in capitalists, while work that gave the proletarian moral satisfaction and social recognition remained his lot. The social reforms and transformations proclaimed by Comte were not aimed at liquidating the antagonistic social relations engendered by private property, but rather at changing relations between people, and an intellectual-moral reform of consciousness. Comte's teaching was the antithesis of Marxism, which was more and more widely penetrating France, and a typical doctrine of the 'centre'.

8. Comte's Place in the History of Sociology

During Comte's lifetime his philosophical and socio-political ideas were comparatively uninfluential. But interest in positivism as a philosophical doctrine grew from the 1860s. Its appeal to rigorous positive knowledge in contrast to speculative metaphysical constructs, which corresponded to the needs of the development of science, was especially important. Many leading naturalists proclaimed themselves positivists. There arose a positivist historiography (Buckle and Taine), a positivist theory of culture (Ernest Renan), a positivist criminology (Cesare Lombroso), a positivist logic and psychology, and theory of literature and art, and even a positivist 'metaphysics' (Vacherot and Fouillée).

Comte's role in the history of sociology is very contradictory. Having almost completely synthesised many of the main ideas of the social science of his time, he aimed them against the speculative-abstract approach to social life and theological conceptions. The appeal to positive knowledge, recognition of the law-governed nature of history, attention to study of social institutions and of the structure of society—all had a strong influence in his time on the development of social science. Historians of sociology remark on his creative mind,[29] and his encyclopaedic knowledge; some authors have even drawn a parallel between him and Hegel.[30] According to a modern French commentator, reading Comte leaves an impression of reading a contemporary and his work is still topical.

Many of the ideas and concepts put forward by Comte have in fact firmly become currency of bourgeois sociological thought. They include the idea of society as an organic whole, developed in organistic theories, and in the sociological conception of Comte's major follower in France, Emile Durkheim, and later in Parsons' structural functionalism.[31] The delimitation of the laws of the development and functioning of society, and the search for factors determining historical development, social integration, and the stability of social systems were seminal. This theme became a leading one in the French sociological school. Comte's idea of the objective nature of sociology as a science developing along the principles of natural science, had a great influence on social science.

But many of the ideas associated with his name had in fact been put forward by his predecessors, in particular by Saint-Simon. In addition there were two root faults in his sociological conception, as in all positivist sociology, viz., idealism, which was expressed in his law of three stages and his attempts to explain historical changes primarily by the influence of ideas; and its metaphysical and antidialectical character.[32] The latter was expressed, in particular, in the speculative nature of his theory of progress.

Comte's sociology is full of contradictions. While calling for reforms based on positive knowledge of society, he, in fact, at the same time, rejected the possibility of intervention in the course of history. His programme of socio-political reorganisation of society was inspired by a conservative social ideal. As Coser aptly puts it, he 'was torn between the twin demands of order and progress'.[33]

In trying to make social science 'positive', Comte dares assert, in spite of the extreme difficulty of his grand subject, that, properly treated, it permitted conclusions just as certain as those of geometry itself.[34] He included elements of religious thinking in social science as well, calling for the postulates and dogmas of sociology to be applied without reflection and analysis, and for them to be believed without doubt. That reduced the principles of science to the level of everyday consciousness. Comte himself often asserted that positive philosophy was only a modification of ordinary common sense. Science was thus deprived of one of its most essential qualities, namely, antidogmatism.

Notes

[1] The *Cours* was translated and condensed into two volumes with Comte's approval by Harriet Martineau, and published by J. Chapman in London in 1853 (3rd edition, 1893) under the title *The Positive Philosophy of Auguste Comte* (hereinafter referred to as *The Positive Philosophy*). Another edition in three volumes was published by George Bell & Co. in London in 1896.

[2] The *Système* was translated by J. H. Bridges and published by Longmans, Green in London in four volumes in 1875-77, under the title *System of Positive Polity.*

[3] Comte explained that the word 'positive' (*positiv*) had several meanings: (1) the real or opposed to the chimerical; (2) the useful as opposed to the useless; (3) certainty in contrast to indecision; (4) the exact as opposed to the vague; and (5) the positive as the contrary of the negative ('In this case, it indicates one of the most prominent properties of the true modern philosophy, by showing it destined, by its nature, not to destroy but to organise' (*Discours sur l'esprit positif. Ordre et progrès*. Paris, 1905, pp 64-66).

The term 'positive', in the sense of 'organic, definite, exact', had been introduced by Saint-Simon, and is met in his works.

[4] For more details of Comte's conception of a science, see: B. M. Kedrov. *Klassifikatsiya nauk* (Classification of the Sciences), Book 1 (Nauka, Moscow, 1961).

[5] Auguste Comte. *Cours de philosophie positive*, 3rd ed., Vol. 1 (Baillière et Fils, Paris, 1869), p 21.

[6] B. M. Kedrov, *Op.cit.*, p 141.

[7] André Cresson. *Les courants de la pensée philosophique française*, Vol. II (Colin, Paris, 1927), p 172.

[8] See: Auguste Comte. *Cours de philosophie positive*, Vol. 1 (Baillière et Fils, Paris, 1869), pp 40-41.

[9] See: August Comte, *Op.cit.*, Vol. 4, p 268.

[10] *Ibid.*, p 301.

[11] *Ibid.*, p 306.

[12] *Ibid.*, p 322.

[13] *Ibid.*, p 328.

[14] *Ibid.*, p 260.

[15] *Ibid.*, pp 206-207.

[16] See: Auguste Comte. *Système de politique positive, ou Traité de sociologie*, Vol. 3 (Chez Carilian-Goery and V. Dalmont, Paris, 1853), p 1.

[17] *Ibid.*, Vol. 2, p 183.

[18] *Ibid.*, p 204.

[19] Auguste Comte. *Cours de philosophie positive*, Vol. 1, pp 426-429.

[20] *Ibid.*, p 429.

[21] *Ibid.*, Vol. 4, p 430.

[22] *Ibid.*, p 232.

[23] Auguste Comte. *Cours de philosophie positive*, Vol. 5, p 230.

[24] *Ibid.*, Vol. 6, p 287.

[25] See: Otwin Massing. *Fortschritt und Gegenrevolution. Die Gesellschaftslehre Comtes in ihrer sozialen Funktion* (Klett, Stuttgart, 1966).

[26] August Comte. *Système de politique positive*, Vol. 1, p 448.

[27] *Ibid.*, p 129.

[28] *Ibid.*, p 152.

[29] Lewis A. Coser. *Masters of Sociological Thought*, 2nd Ed. (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, New York, 1977), p 40.

[30] See: F. S. Marvin. *Comte. The Founder of Sociology* (Russell & Russell, New York, 1965).

[31] Paul Kellermann. *Organizistische Vorstellungen in soziologischen Konzeptionen bei Comte, Spencer, und Parsons* (Dissertation, Munich, 1966).

[32] I. S. Kon. *Der Positivismus in der Soziologie* (Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, 1968), p 19.

[33] Lewis A. Coser. *Op. cit.*, p 41.

[34] Auguste Comte. *Discours sur l'esprit positif*, p 111.

3

HERBERT SPENCER'S SOCIOLOGICAL CONCEPTION

Igor Kon

1. Spencer and His Time

The birth of sociology in England is linked with the name of Herbert Spencer (1820-1903). In the middle of the nineteenth century, when his scientific activity was beginning, British capitalism was at the zenith of its prosperity. England, having completed the industrial revolution before all other countries, had far outstripped them in level of economic development. In the eyes of mid-century world opinion, she was the symbol of prosperity and liberalism. In spite of acute class contradictions, the British middle classes were complacently proud of the progress made, and looked to the future with confidence. That mood had its effect, as well, on Spencer's social philosophy.

Spencer worked from 1837 to 1841 as an engineer and technician on a railway, simultaneously studying mathematics and natural sciences. Then, for several years, he contributed to the press. In 1853, having inherited a tidy legacy from an uncle, he resigned his post and began the modest life of an independent scientist and publicist. Even after he had attained fame, he refused all official honours.

In the early 1860s Spencer made a tremendous effort to create a system of synthetic philosophy that would unite all the theoretical sciences of the time. This work included ten volumes, consisting of five separate titles: *First Principles*

(1862), *Principles of Biology* (two volumes, 1864, 1867), *Principles of Psychology* (1870-1872, three volumes, the first edition of which appeared in 1855); *Principles of Sociology* (three volumes, 1876, 1882, 1896), which was anticipated in 1873 in an independent book *The Study of Sociology*, and *Principles of Ethics* (two volumes, 1892, 1893).

What were the sources of his ideas?

In his youth he was not interested in philosophy; later he did not read philosophical and psychological books, preferring to derive the necessary information from conversations with friends and popular editions. According to his secretary, there was not a single book by Hobbes, Locke, Hume, or Kant in his library. His knowledge of history, too, was very weak.

Spencer borrowed much more from the natural sciences, especially from those parts in which the idea of development was being born or worked out. When Darwin's *Origin of Species* appeared in 1858, Spencer warmly welcomed it. Darwin in turn highly valued Spencer's theory of evolution, acknowledged its influence, and even placed Spencer intellectually above himself. Yet, in spite of this respect and influence, Spencer's evolutionism was more Lamarckian than Darwinian.

A second line of influence, perceived and acknowledged by Spencer himself, was the works of English economists of the eighteenth century, especially those of Malthus and Adam Smith. As we know, not only Spencer, but also Darwin deduced their idea of survival of the fittest precisely from Malthus, although they both gave this theory an optimistic, 'progressive' ring, it did not have with Malthus.

Finally, the ideas of the English Utilitarians, in particular of Bentham, whose individualism Spencer intensified even more, had quite a clear influence on him. As an apostle of extreme bourgeois liberalism, he consistently followed the principle of *laissez-faire* all his life. He had already, in his first book *Social Statics* (1851), formulated a 'law of equal freedom',[1] according to which 'every man may claim the fullest liberty to exercise his faculties compatible with the possession of like liberty by every other man'.[2] Freedom of individual actions, competition and survival of the fittest were all that were needed for the development of society. Consistently working up that idea, Spencer opposed not only laws to aid the poor but also any state inter-

ference in public affairs. His ideological position was militantly antisocialist. He considered the principle of collectivism disastrous from the biological standpoint and psychologically absurd, seeing in it encouragement of the worst at the cost of the best.

Spencer's attitude to Comte presents special interest. His own ideas had already been formed in the main when he became acquainted with Comte's works. On the whole he highly appreciated Comte, ascribing to him 'the credit of having set forth with comparative definiteness, the connexion between the Science of Life and the Science of Society'.[3] Comte's 'way of conceiving social phenomena', he wrote, 'was much superior to all previous ways; and among other of its superiorities, was this recognition of the dependence of Sociology on Biology'.[4]

Later, however, there began to be serious disagreements. Spencer was, first of all, much more naturalistic than Comte. The latter's messianism, the 'law of three stages', and other of his attempts to arrive at social development from spiritual development were profoundly alien to Spencer.

> What is Comte's professed aim? To give a coherent account of the progress of *human conceptions*. What is my aim? To give a coherent account of the progress of the *external world*. Comte proposes to describe the necessary, and the actual, filiation of *ideas*. I propose to describe the necessary, and the actual, filiation of *things*. Comte professes to interpret the genesis of *our knowledge of nature*. My aim is to interpret, as far as it is possible, the genesis of the *phenomena which constitute nature*. The one end is *subjective*. The other is *objective*.[5]

Spencer rejected the idea of uniform, linear progress, in the light of which

> the different forms of society presented by savage and civilised races all over the globe, are but different stages in the evolution of one form.[6]

In his view the truth was

> that social types, like types of individual organisms, do not form a series, but are classifiable only in divergent and re-divergent groups.[7]

Finally, Spencer posed the question of the relation of the individual and the social whole quite differently to Comte.

2. The Subject-matter of Sociology

Spencer did not provide a developed, formal definition of sociology or of its relation to other social sciences. But in *The Study of Sociology* he paid much attention to demonstrating the possibility of its existence as a science. This possibility depended on the existence (1) of a universal law of 'natural causality' which operated in society to the same extent as in nature, and (2) of a regular connection of the elements and structure of any phenomenon. By examining in detail the objective and subjective difficulties (including class prejudices) of shaping sociology as a science, Spencer anticipated a number of the theses of the future sociology of knowledge.

The most complicated methodological task for him was to demarcate sociology from history. When studying the laws of the development of society, sociology is, in spirit, a historical science. But in Spencer's opinion, it was related to traditional, narrative, descriptive history in the same way as anthropology to biography. While biography recorded all the chance circumstances in a human life, anthropology studied the state and conditions of the development of the organism. In the same way sociology, even though it rested on historical facts, was closer methodologically to biology.

In contrast to Comte, Spencer not only set out his understanding of the subject-matter and tasks of sociology but also, in fact, realised the principles he proclaimed. His *Principles of Sociology* was essentially the first attempt to construct an integral sociological system on ethnographic material. Under the heading 'The Data of Sociology' he tried to reconstruct theoretically the physical, emotional, intellectual, and especially the religious life of primitive man, and to bring out the origin of his main ideas and notions. Later, as 'the inductions of sociology', which consisted in a kind of general theory of society, he analysed the concepts of society, social growth, social structure, social functions, various systems and organs of social life. In the second volume of *Principles of Sociology* he examined,

employing an immense amount of ethnographic material, albeit uncritically assembled, the evolution of domestic relations (primitive sexual relations, forms of the family, the position of women and children), ritual institutions (including customs), political institutions (under which he examined not only political institutions proper, i.e., the state, representative institutions, courts, and law, but also property, types of society, religious institutions, public professions, and industrial institutions, i.e., production, exchange, division of labour, etc.). His sociology was thus an all-embracing science that included anthropology, ethnography, and a general theory of historical development.

3. Organicism and Evolutionism

Spencer's sociological theory was built around two main principles: the conception of society as an organism and the idea of social evolution. The first principle was connected with the necessity of comprehending the unity of the social whole.

He clearly asked himself the following question, whether society was a real 'entity', or only a collective name for designating a certain number of individuals, which had only a nominal existence. Since the nominalist point of view on society was unacceptable to him, he had to admit that society was a special kind of entity that really existed. He suggested that we have every right to regard it as a special entity, because, although it was made up of discrete units, the constant maintenance of a certain general similarity in the grouping of these units within the locality occupied by each society over the course of several generations and even centuries, however, indicated a certain concreteness of the aggregate formed by them. It was this feature that gave us our idea of society. Because we do not give this name to the transient gatherings that primitive peoples form, but only employ it where a settled life has led to a certain permanence in the distribution of its components within society.

But, if society was a real object, with its own individuality, should it be classed as inorganic or organic? Although Spencer widely employed mechanical analogies (society as an 'aggregate',

etc.) they seemed unsatisfactory to him for constructing a generalised model of the social whole, and he called an organic model to his aid that was more complex and dynamic. One of the chapters of *Principles of Sociology* was entitled 'A Society Is an Organism".

Spencer listed a number of similarities between biological and social organisms: (1) society, like a biological organism, and in contrast to inorganic matter, grew and increased in size during the greater part of its existence (for example, the conversion of small states into empires); (2) as a society grew its structure became more complicated, just like the structure of an organism during biological evolution; (3) the differentiation of structure in both biological and social organisms was accompanied with a similar differentiation of functions; (4) the differentiation of the structure and functions of biological and social organisms was accompanied during evolution with development of their interaction; (5) the analogy between society and the organism could be reversed; one could say that each organism is a society consisting of separate individuals; (6) in a society, as in an organism, even when life as a whole stopped, the separate component parts could continue to live, at least for a certain time. All that, in his opinion, allowed one to treat human society by analogy with a biological organism.

But he also saw essential differences between them. (1) The component parts of a biological organism formed a concrete whole in which all the elements were inseparably united, while a society was a discrete whole, the living elements of which were more or less free and dispersed. (2) The differentiation of functions in an individual organism was such that the capacity to feel and think was concentrated in certain of its parts alone, while in a society consciousness was spread throughout the whole aggregate, and all its units were capable of enjoyment and suffering to approximately the same extent, if not equally. Hence a third difference: in a living organism the elements existed for the sake of the whole; in a society, on the contrary,

> the welfare of the aggregate, considered apart from that of the units, is not an end to be sought. The society exists for the benefit of its members; not its members for the benefit of the society. It has ever to be remembered that great as may be the efforts made for the

> prosperity of the body politic, yet the claims of the body politic are nothing in themselves, and become something only in so far as they embody the claims of its component individuals.[8]

The reservations introduced were most essential for Spencer, who repeatedly protested against the idea of the full identity of society and organism attributed to him (although he himself had given grounds for same). One must not forget that he was an individualist. Whereas the social whole, for Comte, preceded the individual, and the latter was not even an independent cell of society, for Spencer, on the contrary, society was only an aggregate of individuals. He considered dissolution of the individual in the social organism to be impermissible. Hence, also, the important refinement, that society was not simply an organism but a 'superorganism'.

Any developed society, according to Spencer, had three systems of organs. The supporting system was the organisation of the parts that provided nutrition in a living organism, but was the production of necessary products in a society. The distributing system ensured connection of the different parts of the social organism through the division of labour. Finally, the regulatory system, in the person of the state, ensured subordination of the parts to the whole. The specific parts of "organs" of society were institutions. Spencer counted six types of institution: domestic, ritual, political, church, professional, and industrial. He endeavoured to trace the evolution of each of them by means of a comparative, historical analysis. But what were the laws of this evolution?

The concept of evolution had a central place in Spencer's theory. According to him, phenomena occurring anywhere were part of the general process of evolution. There was only one evolution, and it took place in the same way everywhere.

Any process of development, according to him, included two aspects: integration and differentiation. It began with simple, quantitative growth, increase in the size or number of the component elements. The quantitative growth and complication of the structure of social aggregates entailed a process of functional and structural differentiation of the whole. In primitive social organisms their separate parts and functions were weakly differentiated and similar to one another. One and the

1-1147

same partial structure could perform several different social functions in them, and one and the same function could be performed by several different structures. As society grew its parts became more and more unlike one another. These dissimilar parts began to perform ever more different, specialised functions, which had to be co-ordinated.

The division of labour, discovered first by economists as a social phenomenon, and later also recognised by biologists as a 'physiological division of labour', was thus a universal mechanism of development. But the more differentiated functions were, the more important became the existence of a certain regulating, governing mechanism capable of co-ordinating the partial structures. Hence the complication and differentiation of the regulating processes themselves. In the earliest stages of social evolution a differentiation had already begun between rulers and governed, which gradually became more and more marked. The power of the ruler was supplemented by a religious authority arising simultaneously with it and by the power of generally accepted rules of behaviour and customs which gradually became differentiated from both of them.

> So that beginning with a barbarous tribe, almost if not quite homogeneous in the functions of its members, the progress has been, and still is, towards an economic aggregation of the whole human race; growing ever more heterogeneous in respect of the separate functions assumed by the local sections of each nation, the separate functions assumed by the many kinds of makers and traders in each town, and the separate functions assumed by the workers united in producing each commodity.[9]

The evolutionary approach to society, however, raised a number of complex problems. (1) What was the relation of quantitative and qualitative changes in the process of development? (2) What was the relation of the concepts of evolution and progress (a problem already posed by the romantics of the end of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries)? (3) Should the evolution of society be regarded as a single, unidirectional process, or as a series of relatively autonomous processes of development?

Spencer answered the first of these questions in the spirit

of typical 'flat evolutionism'. Social evolution, for him, was a contradictory, but mainly smooth, gradual, and largely automatic process that did not permit of conscious 'acceleration' and 'outside' interference; 'the processes of growth and development may be, and very often are, hindered or deranged, though they cannot be artificially bettered'.[10] That was a direct substantiation of the spontaneity of the development of capitalist society, and of maintenance of the *status quo*. By stressing the organic character of social evolution, and drawing numerous analogies between society and nature, Spencer sharply condemned any attempts at a revolutionary reorganisation, seeing in revolutionary destruction of definiteness an unnatural breach of the law that any evolution 'follows lines of least resistance'.[11]

Spencer's position as regards the relation of evolution and progress, was much more complicated. He concerned himself much with this matter. The idea of the universality of progress, understood as the perfecting of man and society, was common in the middle of the nineteenth century. 'Ameliorism', the philosophy of the gradual improvement of life, was an inalienable part of the social credo of Victorian liberalism. Young Spencer also delimited progress as a value concept, and evolution in a natural-science sense. In the second chapter of *Social Statics* he had stressed that

> progress, therefore, is not an accident, but a necessity... so surely must the things we call evil and immorality disappear; so surely must man become perfect.[12]

But later he turned away from this point of view, and the very concept of progress, considering the term too anthropocentric. When speaking of the 'law of evolution', the mature Spencer already had in mind not 'improvement of life' but only the regular, law-governed, and ever accelerating movement from homogeneity to heterogeneity. He no longer claimed that 'universal progress' applied to any given society. He was quite conscious of the possibility and even inevitability of regressive processes. He understood that if the theory of regress, in its current form, should be considered bankrupt, the theory of progress, too, applied without limitations, would seem unsound.

It was very possible, and even very probable, that regress took place as often as progress. Hence, the notion of the development of society no longer as global Evolution but as a series of relatively autonomous processes. Like other types of progress, he stressed, social progress was not linear, but divergent.

As Perrin justly noted, Spencer had not one but at least four interpretations of 'social evolution': (1) 'as progress toward an ideal "social state" '; (2) 'as the differentiation of social aggregates into functional subsystems'; (3) 'as an advancing division of labor'; and (4) 'as the origin of species of societies'.[13] He never succeeded in combining them all.

4. Spencer's Place in the History of Sociology

Spencer's contribution to the development of sociology, and the evaluation of his works by succeeding generations have been as contradictory as his creative work.

His ideologically important service was his fight against clericalism and defence of the principles of objective investigation of society based on the principles of scientific research. Progressive thinkers of the second half of the nineteenth century were attracted by his confidence in the irresistibility of social evolution, his recognition of the law-governed character of everything that exists, and the seeming rigour and scientific character of his conclusions. It was not by chance that these ideas impressed such people as Jack London and Theodore Dreiser.

But Spencer's agnosticism also opened the road to compromise with religion, while his sociological doctrine had a bourgeois individualist and antisocialist character and was easily converted (in Spencer himself, and his followers) into a direct apology for capitalism. It was not for nothing that Spencerism was warmly welcomed in the USA by such pillars of rising monopoly capital as John D. Rockefeller and James J. Hill.[14]

Spencer's service, as regards theory, was his attempt to combine the historico-evolutionary approach to society with a structural, functional one. With his conception of structural differentiation, and understanding of society as a self-regulating system, and his analysis of the relation of social functions with

the structure of society, he anticipated many propositions of structural functionalism in sociology and ethnology. He was the first in sociology to begin systematic use of the concepts 'system', 'function', 'structure', and 'institution'. His superiority to Comte was his much more consistent reliance on empirical, above all comparative, historical investigations. He was one of the first to try and demarcate the concepts of evolution and progress and overcome the shortcomings of the linear conception of development, throwing a bridge from sociology to ethnology. The systematisation of ethnological material that he carried out, and to an ever greater extent the very mode of classifying and typologising societies, furthered raising of the theoretical standard of ethnological research and the appearance of a number of historico-evolutionary and culturological conceptions. It is not without reason that he has been given an important place in the history of anthropology and ethnography, and psychology. Many of his special observations and conclusions, irrespective of their degree of factual substantiation, stimulated fruitful scientific discussions and disputes.

On the whole, however, Spencer's sociological conception suffered from crude naturalism and mechanicism. He tried, in the interests of his synthetic philosophy, to reduce complex social phenomena to their simplest elements. The concrete content of social life thus escaped his attention. His attempts to apply the general concepts 'differentiation' and 'integration' to society, bypassing formalisation of the concepts, and relying on pre-scientific definitions of society, personality, and mass, generated unclarity and misunderstanding.

As Lenin wrote in this connection,

> Abstract reasoning about how far the development (and well-being) of the individual depends on the differentiation of society is quite unscientific, because no correlation can be established that will suit every form of social structure. The very concepts 'differentiation', 'heterogeneity', and so on, acquire absolutely different meanings, depending on the particular social environment to which they are applied.[15]

For all his thirst for concreteness, Spencer's theory of evolution remained speculative. Empirical facts illustrated the con-

ception, but it was not based on them. The vast factual material contained in the 17 volumes of his *Descriptive Sociology* was selected by his assistants quite uncritically and from different sources.[16]

While outwardly describing the cultural and functional connections of the social whole, Spencer's organic model of society did not disclose its real foundations. He did not see either the dialectic of the productive forces and relations of production or the basic position of the latter as regards politico-ideological phenomena. He treated the leading role of the social division of labour in the forming of classes in a conservative, protective spirit, and ascribed an exclusively destructive role to class struggle. Furthermore, he also could not theoretically resolve the contradictions between organicism and individualism.

The contradictoriness of his influence on sociological thought follows from that. Although not recognised by official university science, his sociology had acquired great popularity at the end of the nineteenth century among a broad readership, especially in the United States, where nearly 369,000 copies of his books were sold between 1860 and 1902.[17] According to Charles Cooley, Spencer's *The Study of Sociology* 'probably did more to arouse interest in the subject than any other publication before or since'.[18] Spencer's visit to the USA in 1882 was a real triumph. His influence on U.S. social thought became less marked in the early twentieth century, not so much because his ideas had reached their limit as because his language had become (as Hofstadter put it), 'a standard feature of the folklore of individualism'.[19]

The attitude to him, however, was never unequivocal. He was seen at first mainly as a theorist of naturalistic evolutionism; he enjoyed his greatest influence among spokesmen of social Darwinism (W. G. Sumner). Proponents of a psychological orientation, on the contrary, criticised him for his naturalism. The crisis of evolutionism at the turn of the century evoked sharp criticism of Spencer. But Durkheim had already seen in him the forerunner of the functionalist trend. According to Luther Bernard's poll, 258 American sociologists in 1927 considered Spencer the most influential European sociologist.[20] Later, however, he was cited less and less. In 1937 Talcott

Parsons unambiguously wrote: 'Spencer is dead'.[21] Historians of sociology of 1940-50 agreed with that. The advent of neo-evolutionism, on the one hand, and of cybernetics and the systems approach, on the other, again raised interest in the West in him, and he was seen as a precursor of these new currents, although they were not born, of course, on foundation of Spencerism.

Notes

[1] Herbert Spencer. *Social Statics; or the Conditions Essential to Human Happiness* (Appleton & Co., New York, 1882), p 105.

[2] *Ibid.*, p 94.

[3] Herbert Spencer. *The Study of Sociology* (Henry S. King & Co., London, 1875), p 328.

[4] *Ibid.*, p 330.

[5] Herbert Spencer. *An Autobiography*, Vol. 2 (Watts & Co., London, 1926), p 488.

[6] Herbet Spencer. *The Study of Sociology*, p 329.

[7] *Ibid.*

[8] Herbert Spencer. *The Principles of Sociology*, Vol. 1 (Williams and Norgate, London, 1885), pp 449-450.

[9] Herbert Spencer. *First Principles* (Williams and Norgate, London, 1890), pp 346-347.

[10] Herbert Spencer. *The Study of Sociology*, p 401.

[11] Herbert Spencer. *First Principles*, p 239.

[12] Herbert Spencer. *Social Statics*, p 80.

[13] Robert C. Perrin. Herbert Spencer's Four Theories of Social Evolution. In: *The American Journal of Sociology*, 1976, *81*, 6: 1339-1359.

[14] Richard Hofstadter. *Social Darwinism in American Thought* (The Beacon Press, Boston, Mass., 1955).

[15] V. I. Lenin. The Economic Content of Narodism and the Criticism of It in Mr. Struve's Book. *Collected Works*, Vol. 1 (Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1986), p 412.

[16] See: Robert G. Perrin. *Art. cit.*

[17] Richard Hofstadter. *Op. cit.*, p 34.

[18] Charles H. Cooley. Reflections upon the Sociology of Herbert Spencer. In: *The American Journal of Sociology*, 1920, *26*, 2: 129.

[19] Richard Hofstadter. *Op. cit.*, p 50.

[20] D. N. Levine, E. B. Carter, and E. M. Gorman. Simmel's Influence on American Sociology. In: *The American Journal of Sociology*, 1976, *81*, 4: 840, 841.

[21] Talcott Parsons. *The Structure of Social Action* (The Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., 1949), p 3.

4

NATURALISM IN SOCIOLOGY OF THE TURN OF THE CENTURY

Alexander Hofman and *Alexander Kovalev*

1. Evolutionism—the Basis of the Naturalistic Schools of Sociology

The middle and second half of the nineteenth century was a time in the intellectual history of Europe of an almost universal enthusiasm for the advances of natural science and the flourishing of the positivist-naturalistic outlook, under whose determinant influence the sociology of the time developed.

Darwin's theory of evolution forced scientists to pay attention to the simple fact (previously ignored because of the dominance of the theological outlook), that there was not only a difference between man and animals but also a similarity, that man was the product of a long biological evolution and one of the links in its chain. The theory of evolution became a main factor in the ideological climate of the second half of the century. Evolutionism, as the leading trend of the social thought of the time, was based on the ideas of the unity of the laws of the history of nature and of man, the unity of the method of the natural and social sciences, so undermining providentialist and finalist explanations of development.

Evolutionism closely linked sociology with ethnology, solving their common problems of the genesis of society and culture. To that was due the exceptional attention of sociology then to primitive history and comparative study of the origin and development of the social institutions of peoples without

a written language, whose culture was transmitted predominantly by oral tradition. The idea of the intrinsically determined natural evolution of human society was given its classical form in the historical and ethnological works of E. B. Tylor (1832-1917).

Social evolution began to be regarded in the biologico-evolutionary schools as a continuation or component of biological evolution. Spokesmen of this trend suggested that there was an organic law of the development of social institutions simililar to the law governing the growth of organism, that determined the gradual, regular character of their changes, identical for the whole world. The influence of this linear conception of social evolution was strengthened by the fact of Darwin's evolutionary ideas having long had an effect on sociology through the medium of Spencer's philosophical evolutionism and its universal 'hypothesis of development' and principle of differentiation.

Evolutionary sociology also inherited from social philosophy a metaphysical posing of the problem of the 'prime movers' of history. The positivistically oriented naturalistic trends, which were united by an approach to society as a part of nature governed by its universal laws, endeavoured to make this concept to some extent empirical, and began to explain the development of society by the action of certain determinant factors understood as natural objective forces. But the concept of a factor remained in general polysemous and contradictory, not least because of the uncritical empiricism of these trends. In spite of the positive significance of the quest for natural laws of social development, and of the orientation on objective science, which undermined the positions of voluntarism, the cult of great men, and theological and spiritualist conceptions in sociology, the weak point of naturalistic evolutionist sociology was precisely the one-sided naturalisation (usually biological) of social 'forces' and 'factors' to the detriment of understanding history as a process of human activity.

The bringing to the fore of certain natural factors or driving forces of social development and sometimes of methodological models of a certain natural science, is the basis for classifying the naturalistic schools.

2. The Mechanistic School

The prestige of the methodology of classical natural science in sociology, and the influence of the mechanistic understanding of the world and of vulgar materialist tendencies on it, are most clearly seen in the mechanistic school, which was the latest ideological basis for many naturalistic trends.

Sociological conceptions that equate social processes and phenomena with physical ones, and employ the concepts of mechanics, physics in the broad sense, energetics, etc., to explain the social world, can be conditionally assigned to the mechanistic school.

Mechanists developed an understanding of society as a statistical aggregate of parts (in contrast to the organic conception of society), the prototype of which was the concept of a mechanism as distinct from a living organism. The 'aggregate' conception of society encouraged application of statistical methods in sociology based on a corresponding concept of a whole.

Quantitative data and graphic presentations of them were widely employed by the American economist and sociologist H. C. Carey (1793-1879), author of one of the first developed mechanistic theories in nineteenth-century sociology.

Carey's principal sociological works, the three volumes of *The Principles of Social Science* (1858-60) and *Unity of Law* (1872), shared the monism and principles of Spencer's mechanistic evolution.

Following the reductionist logic of mechanism, Carey looked for simple laws governing matter in all its forms and identically true for physical and social sciences, differing only in the objects of their application and mode of expression. The physical laws of gravity, attraction, and repulsion, for example, received corresponding social forms of the association and concentration of population. For Carey man was a molecule of society, and association a variety of the 'great law of molecular attraction'. He often resorted in his reasoning to naïve mechanistic generalizations and analogies, greatly exaggerating their explanatory force. It was obvious, in his view, from the principle of the indestructibility of matter, that production and consumption were simple conversions of matter, trade and commerce the

shifting of matter in space, and so on.

The revolution in science at the beginning of the twentieth century did not prevent attempts to explain the social in a quantitative, mechanistic way. Certain naturalists, in particular the eminent chemist Wilhelm Ostwald (1853-1932), developed a 'physiosociology'.

In his *Energetische Grundlagen der Kulturwissenschaft*,[1] Ostwald suggested that energetics could provide the social sciences with certain fundamental heuristic principles, though not all the explanations they were in need of. The cultural process, from the very general, energetic point of view, was a transformation of free energy into bound. The greater the amount of bound energy obtained in this transformation, the more significant the progress of culture was.

This universal criterion, based on the laws of the dissipation of energy and growth of entropy, made it possible not only to measure social progress but also to measure the increase in the viability (progress) of an organism or biological species as a whole, which followed from the fundamental unity of the world evolutionary process. Evolution was characterised by a mounting differentiation and complication of the organisation and functions of an organism, animal species, human group, society, etc. The ultimate argument for social progress, Ostwald suggested, was that, because of the gradual perfecting of the organisation of the human groups, man made increasingly better use of the free energy of the world, which happened in two ways that seemed to be the essence of social evolution, viz., the division and combination of labour.

Ostwald translated other sociological and economic categories (in particular social order and the state), regarded as conditions of the best transformation of energy, into the language of energism in the same way.

The authority of mathematical natural science helped spread the mechanistic type of thinking in the early part of this century. Ideas of social physics were developed in one way or another by Vladimir Bekhterev, Vilfredo Pareto, and others.

Theorists less competent in natural science simply introduced any laws of physics, mechancis, chemistry, and biology that they knew or considered appropriate into the explanation of social phenomena. It was a common fault of the mechanistic

school to 'dress up' current popular ideas of sociology and the philosophy of history in a physical terminology, which gave rise only to pseudo-explanations. Such were the attempts at a 'thermodynamic' interpretation of history, which sometimes employed physical theories, mistaken, but popular in their day, like that of 'the thermal death of the universe'. Motion, life, change, and history existed while there was inequality of energy. A state of social entropy in the future as a dead, inert equality, like the thermal death of the universe, was predicted from the thermodynamic laws of the constancy of the quantity of energy and the irreversibility of the transfer of energy from a higher level to a lower. The conservative romantics' old history-of-philosophy conception will be readily recognised in this energetics clothing.

Many of the theories of mechanists logically infringed the law of the adequacy (equality of number) of subject and predicate. The statements of Carey and other 'social physicists' about energy and gravitation, for example, were made as if they specially applied to social phenomena, whereas they were applicable to a much broader class of phenomena and to all objects of a physical nature. As a result the really specific features of the social world that belong to it alone were lost sight of.

Certain aspects of the heritage of the mechanistic school found reflection, however, in attempts to employ cybernetics and the general theory of systems in sociology from the standpoint of the tendencies of modern science to bring fields of knowledge closer together that are very remote from one another, and to look for universal principles and analogies of them, and for a structural community of heterogeneous systems and phenomena. As proponents of quantitative analysis in sociology the mechanists made a significant contribution to the theory of social measurement and statistics by creating a method of numerical estimates of the scale of man's transformation of natural energy into socio-economic energy.

3. The Geographical School

The socio-philosophical idea evolved from a global comparison of society and nature into a special study of the influence of

various environmental factors (climate, relief, natural wealth, etc.) on separate social processes and phenomena (growth of population, the productive forces, the political system, etc.).

Reflections on the significance of the geographical environment for human society went to two logical extremes. Proponents of mechanical geographical determinism asserted that all man's activity was exclusively governed and conditioned by his natural surroundings. Exponents of absolute cultural determinism claimed that culture determined the very perception of the environment and its significance for man, and therefore that the explanation of human activity should be culturological; they underestimated the fact that people's cultural possibilities and opportunities are still different in different natural conditions. The denial of any influence of the environment, reduced to the absurd, led to a kind of socio-cultural solipcism. It is important to emphasise that the geographical trend in social thought did not in any way coincide with narrow geographical determinism, which was only a part of it. Attempts had already been made in the nineteenth century at a 'systems' (as we now call it) way out of the difficulties generated by dichotomies of the type of 'man–nature', and 'culture–environment', by treating man, culture, and the environment as a whole, as a single characteristic of a geographical region. Man had firmly become a part of nature for science, and not a divine exception to it.

In the second half of the nineteenth century, an excessively broad interpretation of Darwin's theory of natural selection became the prototype of a theory of the unidirectional evolution of social structures depending on the geographical environment. The theory of geographical determinism was very broadly accepted then and seemed well grounded from the scientific point of view. A useful result of this theorising after the manner of biology was the attention given to the areal distribution of population, and to human ecology (in which one can see rudiments of today's social ecology).

Natural factors like climate, soils, relief, the distribution of water resources and minerals, flora and fauna, geophysical and cosmic processes, the change of the seasons, and so on, also came into the field of view of social geography and the geographical currents in sociology. The following were regarded as

among the principal social phenomena that depended on these factors: (a) the distribution and density of population over the globe, and its health and fertility; (b) physical and psychological racial differences in constitution, temperament, forms of morality, frequency of cases of great talent, etc.; (c) types of occupation and economic activity, the organisation, rhythm, and cycles of the latter, and the population's level of prosperity and well-being; (d) types of socio-political organisation, social institutions, and marriage; (e) possibilities of cultural contacts and borrowings, rates of economic and cultural development; (f) religion, mythology, art and literature—in short almost all the manifestations of social life.

Both positivist history and philosophy, and geography, promoted the forming of a geographical school in sociology in the nineteenth century. The credo of geographical determinism, fascinated by the methodology of classical natural science, was formulated for a long time by the eclectic French philosopher Victor Cousin (1792-1867):

> Give me the map of a country, its configuration, climate, waters, winds, and all its physical geography; give me its natural products, its flora, its zoology, and I will undertake to tell you *a priori* what the man of that country will be like, and what role that country will play in history, not accidentally but necessarily; not in this period, but in all; and, finally, the idea it is called on to represent![2]

Naturalism and geographical pseudodeterminism had penetrated all branches of the social sciences then, even systems of an idealist hue. From the middle of the century a solar-meteorological theory flourished in religious studies (Max Müller and others) that interpreted myths as allegories of astronomical and atmospheric phenomena and traced the sources of faith and gods to majestic natural catastrophes. Ernest Renan argued about the 'spirit of monotheism' in the desert landscape. And Hippolyte Taine explained, in his *Philosophie de l'art*, the difference between Florentine and Flemish painting, for example, by differences in the geographical conditions of Italy and the Low Countries.

The English positivist historian Henry Buckle (1821-1862), trying to substantiate the objective pattern of historical develop-

ment, adduced numerous, at first glance, plausible examples of how a specific landscape, climate, soil fertility, and nutrition determined differences in consciousness, physique, accumulation of wealth between nations, and later in social organisation and ultimately in historical destinies.[3] He made the reservation, however, that mental factors gradually acquired superiority over physical ones at the highest levels of development. His ideas affected certain trends in economic geography and sociology, whose spokesmen claimed it was enough to know a society's natural wealth, energy sources, and natural lines of communication, to define the character and volume of its production, its main economic functions, etc.

Buckle ignored a number of intermediate relationships between the social factors themselves, and the functional relations between them and the environment when drawing conclusions about the direct, unambiguous dependence of economic, psychic, and social facts on the physical environment. At the same time he tacitly or openly adopted, as a general scientific ideal, physical monism and mechanistic determinism and their notions of the human mind's passive copying of the external world. He underestimated, moreover, the results of cultural diffusion and mutual influence, since he often depicted the effect of the environment as if a society always lived in complete isolation, as a culturally independent entity.

Geographers, who shared many of the mistakes of positivist historiography, also endeavoured to bring out the role of physical factors of the environment in the development of society.

One eminent sociogeographer was Karl Ritter (1779-1859), who is considered a founder of modern geography along with Alexander Humboldt (1769-1859). His methodology was based on the idea of an interaction of nature and culture, and of the interconnected nature of all the elements that formed a historically concrete geographical region.[4] The land was a single 'organism', divided into internally linked, integrated regions. A correct determination of the boundaries of these regions called for a thorough description of the landscape and relief, climate, vegetation (especially the cultivated vegetation), the animal kingdom, and man in his historical interaction with these elements of the environment, etc.

The philosophical organicism of the German romantics and their belief in a world order that united polar relations in a higher synthesis was the basis of Ritter's world outlook, rather than naturalism.

His significance for the social sciences was due to man and history having an important place in his geography. In his view geography should explain how man influenced the space he inhabited, and how he himself was 'brought up' and 'educated' by working in favourable or harsh conditions. The periods of maximum cultural flowering of each region had a special interest for him, because, in his view, the highest degree of harmony between nature and culture was attained then.

Problems that were later differentiated, and became the subject-matter of investigation in various fields of geography and sociology, were organically merged in Ritter's work. After him there was a clearly marked tendency to split geography into two parts, physical geography, and social or anthropogeography, in which economic, political, historical, cultural, and statistical geographies made their appearance in turn at various times in different countries.

Friedrich Ratzel (1844-1904), the German zoologist, traveller, journalist, and sociologist, a professor of Leipzig University, played a leading role in shaping anthropogeography and, in particular, political geography.[5]

He defined the subject-matter of anthropogeography, in line with the general tradition of the century, as study of the human race to the extent that the latter's vital manifestations were determined by the geographical environment. Ratzel, a biologist by education, strove to unite the methods and concepts of biology, ethnography, and geography in accordance with the ideology of naturalism. He considered that anthropogeography should be part of a general biogeography and should employ the usual, ordinary ecological and evolutionary concepts when studying political and economic development.

His *Politische Geographie* (1897) combined a scientific description of the differentiation of cultures in accordance with the properties of the geographical environment with biologiser speculations, especially when explaining the areal expansion or contraction of states. And he had an inherent mistaken tendency, typical of geographical determinism, to see direct causal

1147

connections between the properties of the natural environment and human practice, bypassing the mediating social links and mechanisms.

He divided all the consequences of the influence of the environment into static (fixed in the main in the constant biopsychic properties of individuals) and dynamic (the changing historical results of socio-political organisation). The direct effect of geographical factors lasting for millennia, especially of climate and spatial situation, were the cause of somatic and psychic differences between groups of people living in different territories. Mountains and spatial seclusion, for example, developed traditionalism in people, and narrow nationalism, while plains and seas developed such psychic features as a nostalgia for space and a spirit of expansion and bold initiative. Natural boundaries (mountains and seas) promoted the development of isolated social groups with an underdeveloped political authority, while plains promoted centralisation and a strong authority for defence against the raids of nomads, which later carried over into a strong socially and culturally integrated state organisation. The spread of languages and culture was governed by the same laws.

States functioned as living organisms subject to natural processes of growth and decay, and as such could not be confined to rigid boundaries. Area, space (*Raum*), and location (*Lage*) were necessary factors for the rise of states. The survival of nations or cultures was linked with their capacity for expansion and improvement of their geographical position.

It was only a step from that to conversion of the biological analogies into a political ideology. That step was taken by the so-called school of German geopolitics headed by Karl Haushofer (1869-1946), who created a 'teaching' of allegedly geographically determined trends in the development and expansion of states.[6] The notorious arguments about Germany's lack of 'living space' (*Lebensraum*), and the unnaturalness of her political boundaries employed to justify fascist aggression were drawn from the arsenal of geopolitics.[7] The author of the term 'geopolitics', the Swedish sociologist Rudolf Kjellén (1864-1922) also interpreted it, under the influence of Ratzel, as a doctrine of the state as a geographical organism, eclectically combining concepts of geographical determinism, social Darwin-

ism, biological, organic, racial and anthropological theories.[8]

A very typical feature of vulgar geographical determinism in the explanation of historical events was the broad enlistment of trite 'psychological truths' of common sense as intermediate factors. That in particular distinguished many political geographers who employed, as needed, both age-old prejudices and the 'latest' racial inventions about the 'spirit of the people' alleged to be moulded by the geographical environment.

The content of political geography, however, was not just dubious pseudogeographical explanations and forecasts of political events, willy-nilly covering up certain political sympathies. Many political geographers made substantial historical studies of the formation, expansion, and decline of various 'political zones' and their administrative centres, frontiers, and defence lines. There was sense in asking how to appraise the 'political potential' latent in the interaction of a political community and its environment. In the West political geography successfully studied the influence of political power on the physical and social aspects of the landscape, the shaping of linguistic and cultural associations, and other topics.

In the early part of this century American environmentalism became the continuer of the old geographical trend in the social sciences. What was relatively new in it was a partiality for statistical and other 'rigorous' methods of testing the popular hypotheses of geographical determinism. Ellen Semple, the founder of environmentalism, an orthodox populariser of Ratzel, developed the idea of the physical environment's 'control' over man's life activity in a certain territory.[9]

A leading spokesman of environmentalism was the American geographer, Ellsworth Huntington (1876-1947), a geologist by education. Employing the methods and data (often unreliable) of statistics, paleobotany, climatology, history, demography, and other sciences, he endeavoured to substantiate the existence of close correlations between changes ('pulsations') of climate and the progress or decline of civilisations.[10]

Huntington established the following mediating links: (1) climate influenced a population's health (to estimate this he studied the coincidence of monthly curves of mortality and temperature, and relied on contemporaneous experimental research, etc.); (2) climate influenced physical and mental ac-

tivity, and labour productivity, and consequently caused fluctuations of the business and economic variables of society (his main empirical basis for that was data on the parallelism of the death rate and the cycles of business slumps and booms); (3) insofar as civilisation was a function of the energy and productivity of a nation, favourable or adverse fluctuations of climate determined the growth, decline, and shifting of civilisations.

Huntington also developed old ideas of the gradual geographical shifting of civilisations from the Afro-Asian cradle to the colder and more varied climate of North-Western Europe. The theory of the 'northern drift of civilisation' had already been defended in various versions by the Frenchmen Camille Vallaux,[11] Pierre Mougeolle,[12] Edmond Demolins, and many others. But the criteria for compiling the comparative maps and correlations by which Huntington consolidated this theory, were extremely subjective and Europe-centred. He based his ranking of civilisations on 'activism', repeating the old prejudices (whose source was the works of the fourteenth-century Arab historian ibn-Khaldun), that a higher culture and more complex forms of socio-political organisation could only arise in a temperate climate, and not in a subtropical or polar one. He suggested that the abundance of the gifts of nature in the subtropics did not call for large outlays of labour and led to the inertness and laziness of the people of the south, while the struggle against cold and hunger in a polar climate developed resignation and left no forces for the development of culture. In the end the law of the shifting of the focal centres of culture to the north remained speculative and based on a one-sided selection of facts. The introduction of elements of technological determinism also did not save it; Vallaux, for example, saw the cause of shifts of culture to the north in the development of techniques to defend man against cold.

The 'eternal laws' of Huntington and other environmentalists did not stand up to the test of rigorously established facts, but their many valuable observations and even certain hypotheses got indirect support from specialists (biologists, climatologists, psychiatrists, etc.). The environmentalists' attempts to link business cycles in the economic affairs of society with periods of solar activity, for instance, collapsed, but many psychologists and criminologists have noted complex dependences

between this activity, fluctuations of atmospheric pressure, and other climatic phenomena, on the one hand, and physiological processes, nervous excitability, and through them certain psychological and social processes, on the other hand. Adolph Quételet, and later Cesare Lombroso, noted 'seasonal' fluctuations of certain crimes. The influence of cosmic and planetary processes on social psychology was studied in Russia by Chizhevsky's school.[13]

In modern American sociogeography there is still a striving toward a rigorous determinism and a quantitative approach, but in more limited models with a high probability of prediction. The problematic of environmentalism is not studied on its old global plane, but more specifically.[14]

A 'cultural geography' was developed in the USA at the end of the last century, partly as a reaction to environmentalism, employing the anthropological idea of culture (Alfred Kroeber and others).[15] It paid close attention to man's activity that altered his habitat. It regarded the earth's surface as the imprint of man's way of life, and of his historical past, and as material evidence of the spread of a culture.

An accentuating of the active role of man in his interaction with nature was particularly characteristic of the tradition of French sociogeography, beginning with the school of Frédéric Le Play (1806-1882), one of the founders of modern social ecology. He put forward a triad formula of the determinant factors of human life, viz., habitat, work, and family.

The leading spokesmen of Le Play's school were Henri de Tourville (1843-1903) and Edmond Demolins (1852-1907). When the school was compiling its family household monographs (well known in the history of social research), it necessarily studied the physical geography of the household or society: soil, relief, climate, distribution of water, etc. Demolins' main work *Comment la route crée le type social* (1901-03), based on extensive historical material, which was not free of the usual mistakes of geographical determinism, traced the main links between geographical location and various characteristics of social organisation, forms of labour, property, etc. According to him, their living on plains, for instance, determined the occupation of pastoralists and the absence of land appropriation at an early stage of historical development, since it was more

important for nomads to be able to travel freely over the plains than to be owners of land, and also determined other features of the 'social type'. Tourville, studying the origin of society of the Western type, pointed to Scandinavia and its isolated fiords as a "world laboratory" where a private, particularity type of man, family, and society could be moulded.

The French 'possibilists' were opponents of geographical pseudodeterminism. Their spokesmen considered that an identical environment did not exist in reality either for individuals (by virtue of differences in their reaction to one and the same natural conditions, and innate properties) or for cultures of different levels of development. Possibilism broke up the static conception of the environment as given once and for all with no relation to the active, historical subject. The historicism of this trend prompted it always to pose the matter concretely: an environment for what? and for whom? what were the *possibilities* of employing a given culture in it?

The founder of the French school of social geography was the geographer and historian Paul Vidal de la Blache (1845-1918), who suggested that it was not a given environment that determined a way of life but rather the gradual historical changes that it underwent as a result of a changing way of life. For him the landscape was not simply the product of a natural sequence of events but rather the result of man's labour, which created new conditions of existence for future generations.[16]

The merit of French social geography was its exposure of the reactionary pseudodeterminism of German geopolitics. The possibilists showed that the latter often constructed evidence *post factum* (from the historical existence of a certain politico-social phenomenon to the geographical conditions allegedly responsible for it) and against the facts. Elisée Reclus (1830-1905) and Leo Mechnikov (1838-1888), who also belonged to the French school of social geography, had even earlier fought against the antihuman conclusions and racism of certain trends of anthropogeography.[17]

The weak side of possibilism, compared with American environmentalism (the crudeness of whose principles it justly criticised), was its scorning of a quantitative evaluation of the probabilities that characterised the links of certain cultural or economic possibilities with the distribution of geographical

factors.[18] In that sense the methods of contemporary Western social geography, in both its applied and its quantitative branches, are closer to environmentalism than to possibilism.[19]

In our day, when man's impact on nature has grown to an unprecedented extent, the significance of the geographical trend in the social sciences is becoming increasingly greater. It has become obvious that this impact can only be successful when it is governed by the laws of nature and allows for the main links and relations of the whole; otherwise the adverse consequences will tell on man himself as part of nature. A continuity is observable between the geographical trend and present-day 'human ecology', which studies the relationship of man and his environment (in the broad sense), in particular the spatial relations of people and social organisations.

4. The Racial, Anthropological School

The racial, anthropological trend was ideologically one of the most reactionary versions of naturalism in sociology. Racism has existed as a socio-psychological phenomenon since time immemorial, but in the nineteenth century it broadly appealed, for the first time, to the authority of science. The main ideological functions of this trend were to substantiate the privileges of the ruling class in the capitalist state, and imperialist colonial expansionism in foreign policy. One must also remember that the science of races, i.e., physical anthropology, was still in a rudimentary state, and that there was room for various kinds of myth-making and speculation that converted immature scientific knowledge into the pseudoscientific, or even antiscientific.

In spite of the host of differences and nuances inherent in certain racial-anthropological conceptions, they all boiled down to several basic postulates: (1) that social life and culture were a product of racial and anthropological factors; (2) that the races were not equal, and that that was the cause of the inequality ('superiority', 'deficiency', 'danger') of the corresponding cultural creations; (3) that people's social behaviour was wholly or predominantly determined by biological heredity; (4) that racial mixing (miscegenation) was harmful.

All these theses were first put forward in developed form by

the French philosopher, writer, and diplomat Joseph-Arthur Gobineau (1816-1882) in a four-volume work *Essai sur l'inégalité des races humaines*.

Gobineau endeavoured to show that social institutions did not condition the life activity of races but, on the contrary, were determined by it. They were the consequences, not the causes, he declared. The central theme of his work was that the inequality connected with racial differences, and the struggle of races stemming from it, were the cause of the decline and death of civilisations.

Being a pessimist he started from the fatal inevitability of the death of all civilisations, including the European. Miscegenation (necessarily with participation of the 'white' race), which figured initially as a necessary source of the development of civilisation, subsequently led inevitably to its degeneration and death. Gobineau's main assertions were tautological; the mixing of races figured in his conceptions simultaneously as a sign of the degeneration of civilisations and as its cause, so that it turned out that he was in fact concerned with the 'viability' of races rather than the 'viability' of civilisations, since the former was the true subject, for him, of the socio-historical process.

Racism was a direct continuation of Gobineau's elitist outlook; he was an opponent of all forms of social equality and strove to distinguish 'true' hierarchies, and of 'true' élites within them. Since racial inequality was most fundamental, initial, and ineradicable for him, Gobineau brought it to the fore in his explanations of history. He represented the racial hierarchy in the form of a three-rung ladder, on the top rung of which was the 'white' race, on the middle rung the 'yellow', and on the bottom rung the 'black'. He asserted the superiority of the 'white' race, since its had allegedly been the main role in the creation and development of all civilisations. But, according to him, there was a hierarchy within the 'white' race, at the pinnacle of which were the 'Aryans'.

Houston Stewart Chamberlain, an English Germanophile (1855-1927), who lived most of his life in Germany, created another racist 'historiosophy'. His main work, endlessly republished in pre-Nazi and Nazi Germany, was *Die Grundlagen des 19 Jahrhunderts*, in which he gave a superficial, contradictory,

and highly tendentious survey of European history.[20] The supreme 'achievement' of this history, according to him, was the creation of 'teutonic' culture, the 'highest' of all existing cultures. The 'teutonic' culture was the heir of the 'Aryan', revival of whose 'spirit' he called for.[21]

Chamberlain made a highly significant contribution to creation of the misanthropic myths of German fascism. It was not without reason that Nazi 'theorists' awarded him the title of 'people's thinker' and 'prophet' of the Third Reich.[22]

One version of the racial, anthropological trend was 'anthroposociology'. Its main spokesmen were the French anthropologist Georges Vacher de Lapouge (1854-1936) and the German Otto Ammon (1842-1916).

Lapouge considered Gobineau the pioneer of anthroposociology, but he classed Chamberlain as a 'caricaturist' of it.[23] Lapouge's works were based on interpretation of anthropometric data, primarily a comparative statistical analysis of cranial indices. (In anthropology the cranial index is the percentage relation of the maximum width of the head to its maximum length. It was introduced by the Swedish anatomist Anders Retzius in the 1840s.) According to Lapouge anthroposociology had for its object study of the reciprocal reactions of race and the social milieu'.[24] Under the influence of social Darwinism and of the concept of natural selection, he introduced the concept of social selection, six main forms of which he distinguished: military, political, religious, moral, legal, and economic.[25] All of these ultimately had a pernicious influence on social development as a whole, he thought, since the number of members of the most 'valuable' racial type—the dolichoblonds—was steadily reduced by their effect, and furthermore was threatened with complete extinction. One of Lapouge's numerous 'laws', the 'law of epochs', read: 'the cephalic index has tended to increase constantly everywhere since prehistoric times'.[26]

Lapouge's profound historical pessimism was linked above all with that 'law', which postulated disappearance of the 'best'. In another 'law' he tried to establish a universal link between a person's cranial index and his class connection.[27]

Similar theses are to be met in the other spokesman of the anthroposociological school, Otto Ammon, who made a number of anthropometric studies among army recruits and students.

In his *Die Gesellschaftsordnung und Ihre natürlichen Grundlagen* (1896) he endeavoured to combine the principles of social Darwinism and racism in the analysis of social institutions.[28]

The artificiality of the constructs of anthroposociologists showed up very obviously when they were compelled to ascribe outstanding brachicephalic people, whose existence refuted the 'laws' of anthroposociology, to 'a brachycephalic error'.[29]

The works of Ludwig Woltmann (1871-1907) contained an attempt to synthesise racism and social Darwinism. His many books were distinguished by a crude primitivism and a frank parodying of science in order to substantiate the myth of the superiority of the 'Germanic' race. His conceptions were no more than a rationalisation of initial racial prejudices.

In proclaiming the necessity of developing society by 'cultivating' races, the proponents of the racial, anthropological trend called for provision of the most favourable conditions, i.e., privileges, for the 'highest' race, represented either by the 'highest' social strata or by 'chosen' peoples. In other words their endeavours to put anthropological factors at the service of society and culture concealed its opposite: society and culture should serve a certain 'race'. Since the real facts, moreover, did not confirm the racist postulates, the concept 'race' was given a symbolic sense, rather than being interpreted as an aggregate of real physico-anthropological attributes. All of that made racial, anthropological conceptions a handy instrument of the home and foreign policy of imperialism and fascism.

While treating social processes as the product and inverted form of the 'blood game', the racial-anthropological trends was not only a reactionary current within sociology but was also, essentially, an antisociology, because the subject-matter of sociology, society, was itself dissolved in race treated as the main subject of social and historical action.

5. The Bio-Organic School

There have been many varieties of organic conceptions in the history of social thought. In the nineteenth century alone one can note the following: philosophical organicism (Hegel, Schel-

ling, and the Romantics), which opposed the nominalism and mechanicism of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment and its contract conceptions of society; social-psychological organicism, which saw the integral character of society in social reason, opinion, and expression of will as an independent reality; and finally bio-organic theories.

Society had already been likened to an organism in the depths of antiquity.[30] But a very strong orientation to the evolutionary biology of Comte and Spencer was characteristic of the bio-organic school. Historians of sociology usually combine this school with those for which the concepts 'society' and 'organism' are synonymous, and which start from the point that society, like an organism, is not a simple sum of separate individuals (cells), but is a supra-individual whole. Society acquired new qualities, as a whole, and in that sense is greater than the sum of its parts. There is thus a primacy of the whole over the part. The functions of the parts can only be understood through the functions of the whole to which they belong.

In the scheme of this school's theorists, comparative correlations of social systems and biological organisms should help bring out the structure (anatomy) and functions (physiology) of the social organism, and of its organs (institutions) and elements (ordinarily individuals or families) both in relation to the whole and in relation to one another. That methodology was based on a notion of the unity of the laws of evolution, which passed at a certain stage from the individual to the creation of 'super-organisms', i.e., of communities of animals and people.[31] Social evolution was thought of as the same irreversible, linear, and internally conditioned process as the growth of an organism (although there were often more cautious formulations in the school's theories allowing for the specific nature of historical movement).

Extreme organicists likened the development of society to that of a biological organism in accordance with the 'fundamental biogenetic law' of Müller and Haeckel (that ontogenesis repeated phylogenesis) in its simplified interpretation. In their view the stages of the universal history of civilisation (social phylogenesis) were ontogenetically reproduced in the individual histories of young nations, states, and colonies that were in new conditions.[32]

By combining Spencer's idea of differentiation and the bio-genetic law, sociologists of the bio-organic school endeavoured to predict the future stages of social development and to reconstruct past ones. The most highly differentiated and complex social phenomena and functions were usually considered to be the latest in time of origin, while also being those most sensitive to social upheavals, vulnerable, and changeable.[33]

The Russian dignitary (of German origin) Paul Lilienfeld (1829-1903), who published mainly in German, employed the organic methodology in extreme form in sociology. According to him, human society, like other natural organisms, was a real entity. Society differed from an organism in being less integrated. But the great mobility of the elements (individuals) in the social organism meant only that it belonged to a higher class of organisms. Society, being a system of the interactions of people, performed the same functions as organisms of reproduction, growth, differentiation, sickness, death, regeneration, integration of parts, etc. Sociology was based on biology and should apply its laws.

The German economist and sociologist Albert Schäffle (1831-1903) was a leading exponent of the organic school. While sharing with the whole school a conviction of the superiority of the wholist approach to social phenomena, he differed from it by adhering to the traditions of German idealism.

He declared mental relations between people, and ideal and technical modes and forms of intercourse, the subject-matter of sociology. That will be seen in his definition of society, which (according to him) was an indivisible community of organic individuals that arose on the soil of purely mental acts whose outward manifestations were symbols expressing ideas and technical actions that created utilities and embodied the products of human thought in external objects. The social community of individuals differed from the organic, biological links of cells. The essence of the social was not the physico-chemical and biological ties of individuals but their ideal connections (i.e., psychic ties), expressed in their symbolical and technical actions (in 'practical art').

Sociopsychic links were not purely ideal for Schäffle. The sharing of mental activity among separate individuals in society,

given preservation of its integrity, evoked a need to create symbols, means of communication, and special auxiliary institutions to maintain them. Only then did mental, spiritual interaction serve as a co-ordinator of the 'social body' and as a means of preserving its wholeness and the coherence of the functionally separate parts.[34]

The development of material symbols capable of existing relatively independently made their accumulation, transmission, universality, and long life (tradition) possible. Social memory arose, which could measure the advance of society. The existence of a collective consciousness in the succession of generations was another feature of the socium not inherent in organic communities.

Schäffle divided the whole study of social forms and functions into social anatomy, social morphology, and social physiology, concerned with 'social organs and tissues', i.e., with organisations, institutes, and other mass associations of population, and their connections, and social psychology, whose object of study was the mental life of society.

Properly speaking, Schäffle's organico-biological analogies had less significance and interest than his socio-psychological notions. His doctrine of five general types of 'social tissue', some of which were homologues of the tissues of an organism, evoked most criticism. The fifth type, for example, i.e., psychophysical tissue, had the character of institutions operating in the mental sphere and exercising public or private control. Its organic homologue was nerve tissue. He treated the other types of 'social tissue' in a similar way.

But these 'social tissues' were formed by an 'ideal' uniting of active elements (people and their accumulated practical experience) and passive ones (material wealth). The general organisation of the 'social body' was an increasingly complicated structure of these main elements. The 'social body' performed its 'physiological' life activity (functions) only through its active components (individuals and groups of the population), and only for them.

Schäffle himself, like other organicists, incidentally, constantly made the reservation that he was employing organic analogies solely for a more evocative and striking unfolding of the sociological concepts, that the 'social body' was not an

organism in the biological sense, that even the biophysiological element of the social link in marital unions acquired an ever more mental, spiritual character, etc. Under the influence of criticism, he employed organic-biological comparisons much more moderately in the third, two-volume edition of his main work *Bau und Leben des socialen Körpers* (1896),[35] than in the first four-volume edition (1875-78); and later he almost refrained from these comparisons, while retaining the principle of the integral approach.

Almost all organicists went through a similar evolution, in particular Réné Worms (1869-1926), the editor of *The International Sociological Review*. In his *Organisme et société*,[36] he came forward as a typical member of the vulgar wing of the school. Like Lilienfeld, he widely employed such terms as 'social pathology' and 'diseases of society' (to signify social unrest and disturbances), 'social hygiene', and 'improvement' (for social reforms), 'proliferation of society' (for colonial expansion), etc.

In his last works he criticised his own earlier views and concluded that organic theories were only suitable for simple societies, since new factors came into action later that were better described by contract theories. 'Spiritual contact' between people became the principal social factor for him in that period.[37] He thus passed from asserting the biological unity of society to a psychological, social understanding of its wholeness.

The bio-organic school gave struggle for existence a more modest place in the development of society than social Darwinism did, although both schools saw society as part of nature in its highest expression, in which this law of nature should be manifested. For Worms, for example, struggle for existence (which took the form of competition in society) was derived from the law of biological adaptation. The laws of nature and society, in spite of their unity, were manifested differently in nature and society. Natural selection and the struggle for existence were less violent among people. Worms considered that the main, necessary thing was not conflict and clashes but labour and creative activity, not struggle but living effort.

The many works of the sociologist and publicist Jacques Novicow (1849-1912), who lived in France, were devoted to

struggle against social Darwinism and to preaching ideas of the organic solidarity of people and pacifism. For him progress was a special manifestation of the general law of equilibrium; from the political point of view it was the achievement of full unity of views and agreement among people, i.e., mental equilibrium.

The French eclectic philosopher and sociologist Alfred Fouillée (1838-1912) and the biologist and sociologist Alfred Espinas (1844-1922) are usually included in the bio-organic school.

Fouillée tried to combine positivism with idealism, and the principles of determinism with free will and personalism. He held it to be impossible to reduce the psychological to the collective and the moral to the social. For him society was a psychic, 'contractual' organism that existed only through individuals, and was governed by collective heredity, social determinism, and free contract.[38]

Espinas can be considered one of the early predecessors of zoopsychology and ethology. In his opinion zoology, by studying the associations between individuals of the animal kingdom, had promoted the birth of social science. The analogies between these associations and societies were much closer than between associations of cells and society.[39]

The general methodology of the organic school contained both true principles that have penetrated the history of sociological science and false ones that have long been rejected by it.

The attempt to conceptualise the structures and functional links of the social whole was valuable. The problem of combining the 'organismic' picture of the social whole and evolutionary, genetic views was lasting in its modified form that passed into structural functionalism and other systems-oriented trends in sociology. Although evolutionism was one of the main sources feeding the school, its synthesis of synchronic organismic views was unsuccessful. As a result the organicists were not able to give a satisfactory explanation of social changes.

At the beginning of the school's activity the host of possible types of social and cultural entities was reduced to one model, namely the wholeness of the biological organism. But it did not follow from the fact that society was not a simple sum of individuals and formed a certain unity that its wholeness was

identical with or like the wholeness of a biological organism, and its socio-cultural dependencies similar to the biological. The applicability of some of the general formulas to different objects still did not signify their identity in other respects.

The mistaken trend toward ontologising the unity of society, peculiar to the organic school, or toward treating this unity as a standard, had a reactionary political sense; any revolutionary movement seemed a breach of the organic unity of society, an abnormality and pathology. By replacing the openly metaphysical form of the conception of 'the social organism' (for example, the Hegelian, romantic form) by a pseudopositive one, and putting laws of nature and of the biological organism in the place of the Providence and the 'objective spirit', the bio-organic school was also unable to reflect the significance of the personality and the individual will in its theories.

While posing important problems of similar, elementary features in the evolution and organisation of communities of animals and people, the school underestimated the specific qualitative features of human society.

Marxist sociology employs the concept of social organism in order to stress the wholeness of society as systems and relations of social processes, while never replacing social laws by biological ones.

6. The Social Darwinist School

The influence of Darwinism was felt one way or another in the conceptions of the most varied spokesmen of sociological thought, in particular of Gabriel Tarde, Lester Ward, Franklin Giddings, and Emile Durkheim. For them, and a number of other sociologists, Darwinism played the role either of a stimulus of hypotheses or of an auxiliary methodological instrument. But certain non-Marxian scholars made the theory of biological evolution the direct basis of their sociological theories, treating natural selection and the struggle for existence as the main factors of social life. Darwinism was thus converted from a theory of natural science into social Darwinism.

One must emphasise that Darwin himself, and other founders of Darwinism like Alfred Wallace and Thomas Huxley, were

opponents of the direct transfer of biological concepts to the field of the social sciences. Darwin, therefore, cannot be considered the founder of the trend that subsequently came to be called social Darwinism. The person who first systematically introduced the principles of evolutionary theory into the field of the social sciences was Spencer, who treated natural selection, the struggle for existence, and survival of the fittest not only as biological phenomena but also as sociological ones. It was he who was really the creator of the social-Darwinist school. Social Darwinism was not just a sociological trend but also became widespread in other social sciences, publicistic literature, fiction, and belles lettres.

The idea that there was a single social Darwinist 'school' with common theoretical principles is an oversimplification. Among spokesmen of social Darwinism one meets vulgar materialists and idealists, social 'realists' who treat the social whole as independent of the individuals comprising it, and 'nominalists' who accept only individuals as real, racists and antiracialists, liberal reformists, and proponents of spontaneity in social development.

The extent to which social Darwinists likened social processes to biological ones was different. Some built their conceptions directly on the principles of natural selection, struggle for existence, and survival of the fittest. Others argued about the specific nature of the manifestation of these principles in the realm of social life, but remained within the context of this conceptual scheme. The Italian sociologist Michele Angelo Vaccaro (1854-1937), for instance, tried to show, in his *The Struggle for Existence and Its Effect on Humanity* (1885), what was the difference between the struggle for existence among animals on the one hand, and among people on the other.[40] But the sociologists who can be called social Darwinists in the narrow sense had no substantial influence on the subsequent development of sociological thought.

Spokesmen of the other version of social Darwinism did not reduce social processes directly to biological ones; some of them were even opposed to biological analogies. Their conceptions were close to the psychological trend; the terms of evolutionary theory were less often met with them. Nevertheless they also had an orientation to a certain way of interpreting evolu-

1147

tionary theory, which was displayed primarily in their giving social conflicts the principal place in their conceptions. Treatment of social life as an arena of ruthless struggle between individuals and groups was the most common attribute uniting all social Darwinism. The increase in attention to the problem of conflict at the end of the nineteenth century was by no means accidental, since class antagonisms and conflicts between capitalist states had become unusually sharp in that century.

While the conception of conflict followed directly from the theory of biological evolution in the first variety of social Darwinism, it was indirect in the second, or even followed in general from other sources. The sociologists whose conceptions I shall now examine in detail belonged to this second variety of social Darwinism.

Walter Bagehot (1826-1877), the English publicist, economist, and political scientist was one of the first to try to apply the principles of Darwin's theory in social science, in his *Physics and Politics* (1872). He stressed the immense role of natural selection mainly in the initial period of human history.

> Whatever may be said against the principle of 'natural selection' in other departments, there is no doubt of its predominance in early human history: the strongest killed out the weakest as they could.[41]

According to him, the struggle in the world of people was mainly waged between groups, rather than individuals. He considered the striving of some nations to dominate others, and within nations the drive of some social groups to dominate the other groups, to be the main social laws.[42]

While stressing the very important role of intergroup conflicts, Bagehot paid great attention at the same time to intragroup solidarity, a factor of which was imitation. He thus came forward as a forerunner of Tarde, who made 'imitation' the central concept of his conception. Bagehot considered that imitation had its most significant place in the life of 'primitive' societies, that it was linked with the undifferentiated nature of the various spheres of social life, with detailed regulation of individual behaviour, and the cruelty and brutality of the sanctions against deviations from established patterns.

Along with tendencies to imitation, Bagehot noted the existence of an opposite tendency, viz., people's striving to differ from their predecessors, which provided the possibility of progress. He considered the optimum conditions for progress to arise in societies in which there was a proper relation of the two trends, viz., the tendency to variation, which opened the way to innovations, and that to imitation, which ensured social solidarity.

In contrast to Bagehot, the Austrian sociologist and lawyer Ludwig Gumplowicz (1838-1909) did not deduce his conceptions directly from evolutionary theory. He was an opponent of biological analogies and criticised those sociologists (Comte, Spencer, Lilienfeld) who employed them as an explanatory principle; for him biological analogies had no significance for sociology but provided only comparisons and images, and in no case ever yielded knowledge. Gumplowicz's conceptions have often been characterised by historians of sociology as social Darwinism, mainly because of his approach to society as an aggregate of groups struggling ruthlessly among themselves for domination.

The naturalistic conception of history that Gumplowicz shared considered humanity a particle of the universe and nature, a particle governed by the same eternal laws as the whole. The alpha and omega of sociology, its highest truth, and its last word, he suggested, was human history as a natural process.

A fatalistic interpretation of social laws and a fetishising of historical necessity were inherent in Gumplowicz's conceptions. The individual and his freedom figured as a pseudoreality in his interpretation, or as a reality of the second order. Society, on the contrary, was real, and the supreme reality that determined the behaviour of the individual. In this case we meet one of the most extremist versions of 'social realism', i.e., the view of society as a reality not only irreducible to its component individuals but existing apart from and above them.

For Gumplowicz sociology was the philosophical basis of all the social sciences, whose job it was to realise the link between them. Unlike the philosophy of history, whose task was to explain where mankind had come from, and was going, sociology was concerned with investigating social groups and the

relations between them. He considered continuous and ruthless struggle between different social groups the main factor in social life. He declared the main social law to be the drive of each social group to subordinate to itself every other group it encountered in its path, i.e., the drive to enslave and dominate.

According to Gumplowicz the initial, original groups operating in history were hordes united by anthropological and ethnic attributes. In his treatment of the relations between hordes he was a forerunner of Sumner. He introduced the concept 'ethnocentrism', subsequently employed by Sumner, and defined it as the reasons by virtue of which each people believed it had always occupied the highest point nót only among contemporaneous peoples and nations but also in relation to all peoples of the historical past.[43] Gumplowicz found a state of continuous hostility between hordes. While the result of clashes between them was at first the physical annihilation of the defeated, later, in the course of social evolution, the defeated were enslaved by the victors. As a result the state arose. But intergroup conflicts did not disappear. The fundamentally ineradicable struggle between groups continued in a new form; what had been a struggle between anthropologically different hordes at the most primitive level was turned, at the highest stages of development, into a struggle of social groups, classes, estates, and political parties.

The most common division of social groups in Gumplowicz's conceptions, and the main one was that into rulers and ruled. Both had a drive for power; in the ruling classes this was expressed in exploitation, as intense as possible, and consequently in enslavement of the subordinate classes; in the latter this drive was manifested in an increase in the strength of resistance, in a lessening and weakening of dependence.

Why did the relations between groups continually acquire the character of an antagonistic conflict? In reply to that Gumplowicz introduced a solid dose of vulgar economic materialism and naturalism. He explained the ultimate cause of all social processes, including the conflicts that constituted the essence of them, as man's striving to satisfy his material needs. In that connection he claimed that economic motives were always and everywhere the cause of any social movement, and governed all state and social development. Needs, according to

him, could not be satisfied in any other way than through some groups' compulsion and violence against others.

Gumplowicz often employed the term 'race' (in particular in the initial period of his work), and even used it in the titles of his principal works *Rasse und Staat* (Race and State) (1875) and *Der Rassenkampf* (Race Struggle) (1883). He understood race as a social and cultural, rather than a biological phenomenon. He treated 'race struggle' as the struggle of heterogeneous social entities, groups, and communities.[44] He stressed in every way the immeasurably small role of biological heredity and the decisive role of the social environment in the determination of human behaviour, noting that pure races did not exist at the present time, while the mixing of races had a positive significance.

Did that mean that he did not, in general, recognise the significance of racial differences (in the physical, anthropological sense) in social evolution? One must answer that in the negative. He considered these differences determinant in the early stages of social development. The racial factor figured then as a factor of socio-psychological alienation, which was prompted by other causes in the course of subsequent social evolution.

Gumplowicz's conceptions were extremely contradictory. He claimed, for instance, that the problems of the initial stage of society's development did not come within the competence of sociology and other social sciences. At the same time he constantly appealed to the initial, original moments of this development, following on the whole Spencerian evolutionism, which treated complex social formations as aggregates of simple ones.

Gumplowicz showed that the object of sociology (in distinction to the philosophy of history) was not humanity but social groups; at the same time he perceived that humanity could be called the proper subject-matter and scientific object of sociology.

The main contradiction in his theory was that, on the one hand, it proclaimed the specific nature of social phenomena and their irreducibility to the individual and to species man, and on the other hand the ultimate basis of social phenomena was always and everywhere invariant human nature and its incessant striving to satisfy wants, the drive to domination, etc. His claim

that there was a special class of social phenomena that differed from the other phenomena of reality remained purely declarative; the naturalisation of social processes led him to the same biopsychic reductionism that he himself opposed.

Gumplowicz's conceptions were mistaken because they were based on an underestimation of the internal factors of the functioning and development of social groups, so that he saw the reason for the rise of the state in the subordination of some ethnic groups to others, ignoring the role of intraclan and intratribal differentiation in this process.

While treating conflicts and violence as basic factors of social life, Gumplowicz paid no attention to the significance of solidarity and co-operation.

His conceptions were consonant with those of another Austrian sociologist, Gustav Ratzenhofer (1842-1904), author of the books *Wesen und Zweck der Politik* (1893), *Die soziologische Erkenntnis* (1898), and the posthumously published *Soziologie* (1908). He considered the main phenomena and processes of social life to be the following: the self-preservation and multiplication of individuals; change of individual and social types; struggle for existence; the absolute hostility of races; spatial distribution; racial differentiation; dominance and subordination; alternation of the individualisation and socialisation of structures; change of interests; the state; and global society.[45] Like Gumplowicz he considered himself a proponent of monism, claiming that the same regularities operated in society as in nature; in that connection he denied the opposing of the sciences of nature to the sciences of the mind. Sociological regularities, according to him, were close to chemical, and especially, biological ones. Sociology was a philosophical science whose purpose was to provide the basis of all social sciences and politics.

While regarding conflict as the main social process, Ratzenhofer made the category of interest the keystone. Interest was the main principle governing social processes, and contained the key to understanding them. Social life was presented in his interpretation as a play of various interests. He distinguished five main types of interest: procreative (stimulating continuation of the species), physiological (connected with nutrition), individual (connected with the drive to self-assertion), social

(kinship and group), and transcendental (religious). Interests were nothing else than consciousness of inborn biological needs and impulses, which governed the struggle for existence. Social groups arose as an organisation of individuals for the purposes of this struggle. Unlike Gumplowicz, he interpreted social processes in the final count as interindividual, and the group as the product of interactions between individuals.

Ratzenhofer's conceptions influenced the American sociologist Albion Small (1854-1926). Small, following him, treated interest as the main entity of sociological investigation; from his point of view, the notion of interests had to serve 'the same purpose in sociology which the notion of atoms has served in physical science'.[46] 'The whole life-process,' he wrote, 'is at last the process of developing, adjusting, and satisfying interests.'[47]

> Small defined interest quite vaguely as follows: an interest is an unsatisfied capacity, corresponding to an unrealized condition, and it is predisposition to such rearrangement as would tend to realize the indicated condition.[48]

The most general classes of interests were the following: 'health, wealth, sociability, knowledge, beauty, and rightness'.[49] Interest had two aspects: subjective (desire) and objective, i.e., that in which a need, 'the desired thing' made itself felt. Social phenomena as a whole, according to him, were the result of the interaction of three chief factors: '1. nature; 2. individual; 3. institutions, or modes of association between individuals'.[50]

Of all the social Darwinist theories in sociology, Small's contains its specific features least and is most penetrated by psychologism, which was due to Ward's influence. Although Small considered biological analogies a necessary stage in the history of social science, he linked sociology's further progress with a transition from biological analogies to direct analysis of real social processes.[51]

For him, conflict was not a universal factor of social life. He treated it as a form of people's relationships, dominant mainly in the early stages of historical development.

His constructions lacked conceptual rigour: while analysing

a vast number of concepts (association, social process, physical environment, spiritual environment, subjective environment, social functions, social aims, social forces, values, appraisals), he did not try to tie them up into a single system.

An indication of the need for a complex approach to social facts was of essential importance in the methodological part of Small's theory, but he did not develop that idea clearly and consistently enough.[52] He distinguished four phases in research: the descriptive, analytical, evaluative, and constructive. The last phase clarified his view of the purpose of sociology. In his view it should not refrain from value judgments; on the contrary, that was its direct task. Sociology, according to him, should have practical application in 'social technology', i.e., in 'adapting means to ends in practical improvement of society'.[53] Hence his political reformism aimed at criticising the most obvious faults of capitalist society from liberal positions.

Small's conceptions did not have any substantial influence on the development of American sociology, but he played a great part in institutionalising it.

One of the most eminent figures in American sociology was Prof. William Graham Sumner of Yale University (1840-1910). He took the basic principles of his sociology from Spencer. These consisted in assertion (1) of the automatic, undeviating character of social evolution, and (2) of the omnipotence and universality of natural selection and the struggle for existence, and defined Sumner's stance on various economic, political, and moral issues, sometimes even very partial ones.

Starting from a notion of the steady, automatic character of social evolution, he rejected any attempts to reform, let alone revolutionise social relations. The title of one of his essays, 'The Absurd Effort to Make the World Over' (1894) was extremely characteristic in that respect.[54]

Sumner opposed all forms of state control of social life. While a most zealous proponent of the principle of *laissez-faire*, he defended not so much maintenance of the *status quo* as the need for spontaneity in development; that was the specific character of his conservatism. One could formulate his credo as 'evolution knows what to do'.

Evolution, according to Sumner, hewed out its way through the struggle for existence, which was as 'natural' as evolution

itself. Competition can no more be done away with than gravitation, he asserted. In that connection he regarded social inequality as a natural state and necessary condition of the development of civilisation. The idea of natural selection figured in his interpretation as the idea of the naturalness of social selection. As Hofstadter has remarked, we find in Sumner a new version of the Calvinist idea of predestination.[55] The difference lay only in Sumner's putting providentially understood 'evolution' in place of providence, ensuring with iron necessity triumph of the strongest and defeat of the weakest. He considered the accumulation of social wealth in the hands of the few a condition of social progress and not an obstacle to it.

One must stress that the specific features of social Darwinism were mainly manifested in Sumner's publicistic utterances. As for his sociological works, its weight in them was much less. His chief work *Folkways* (1906) analysed much ethnographic material. He considered customs to be ultimately the product of people's fundamental biological needs, in striving to satisfy which they developed certain modes of activity that became a routine and functioned as customs (at the level of the group) and habits (at the level of the individual). He treated folkways or folk customs unusually broadly, including all standardised forms of behaviour in them. He examined two groups of factors as the direct causes of customs. The first was interest.[56] People struggled either with one another or with the surrounding fauna and flora. Customs were thus certain types of defence and attack during the struggle for existence. Secondly, folkways were the product of four motives, which Sumner considered the 'four great motives of human action' in general (thus anticipating William Thomas's 'four wishes'). They were 'hunger, sex passion, vanity, and fear... Under each of these motives there are interests'.[57] Folkways, he stressed, 'are not creations of human purpose and wit. They are like products of natural forces which men unconsciously set in operation'.[58]

Sumner's concepts of 'we-group' or 'in-group' and 'they-group' or 'out-group' acquired very great popularity. Relations within a 'we-group' were ones of solidarity, while hostility prevailed between groups. Hostility was associated with ethnocentrism, which he defined as the 'view of things in which one's own group is the center of everything, and all others

are scaled and rated with reference to it'.[59]

On the whole Sumner created a simplified picture of relations between groups in 'primitive' societies. In fact, co-operation and mutual help are found in the relations between clans and tribes as well as hostility. The biological reductionism of Sumner's conception of custom did not stand up to criticism; if folkways were solely the result of people's biological needs, it would be impossible to explain the existence and long functioning of customs that were harmful as regards biological needs.

Sumner's conception also had undoubted merits. He was one of the first to pose the problem of the normative aspects of social life. If one rejects the initial premisses of his conception of folkways (struggle for existence, etc.), one can find a number of important considerations in it about the characteristic features of customs. The concepts of ethnocentrism, 'we-groups', and 'they-groups' had considerable significance for social psychology and ethnography. But the positive aspects of his conceptions were depreciated by its social Darwinist foundations and the chaotic piling up of ethnographic material not united by any methodological principles. Furthermore, the problem of method itself did not exist for him. When we evaluate his place in the history of sociology as a whole, we must note that when rational propositions are found in his conception they are not only not associated with the underlying principles of his social Darwinism but on the contrary are very distant from them.

Thus, however the conceptions of social Darwinists differ, reductionism is inherent in all of them, i.e., reduction of the laws and patterns of one level of reality to another one. The notion of groups constantly warring with one another, as a new version of Hobbes' conception of 'war of everyone against everyone', was as bankrupt as the opposite notion of people living in harmony and concord.

Social Darwinists drew attention to social conflicts but ignored the leading role of class struggle. Not seeing the connections of conflicts with certain social relations, and ascribing a status of 'naturalness', eternity, and insuperability, to them, social Darwinists came to a one-sided, and biased evaluation of social conflicts.

* * *

In spite of the seriousness of some of the problems posed, the naturalistic and biological-evolutionary conceptions in nineteenth-century sociology were largely unscientific and unhistorical. In his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* Lenin showed the impermissibility of substituting 'eternal' laws of nature for historical laws and regularities. Many non-Marxian sociologists sharply criticised these conceptions in the first half of the twentieth century, though from other standpoints. The biologising of social phenomena began to be a clear anachronism, and naturalistic schools a blind alley in the history of sociological thought.[60] But the disputes have been revived once more in connection with the latest advances of genetics, ecology, and ethology.

Much has also been written in the West about 'sociobiology' as the 'new synthesis' of the biological and social sciences—from molecular and population genetics to the psychology of behaviour and ergonomics.[61] This 'new synthesis' is counterposed to the old one and to the attempts to integrate social and biological knowledge in the old biological, evolutionary schools. But there is a certain continuity of the problems and modes of posing them. The idea of the 'superorganism' has been resurrected and made the object of research. Serious attention is being paid to the system of communications in the collective behaviour of animals and to the similar mechanisms of behaviour in people's social life. This research is necessary in itself, and fruitful. But in that connection there has also been a revival of old naturalistic conceptions, for example, in attempts to make the historical evolution of human society, and the forms of its social organisation, dependent on its gene fund, which is said to determine social behaviour.[62] Dubious attempts are also being made to transfer observations of the behaviour of animals mechanically onto man, although these attempts are based on more cautious scientific descriptions and theoretical constructs than before.

In that connection the philosophical, ideological foundations of the biological, naturalistic, and socio-historical interpretation of the problem of man, and possible points of rapprochement and disagreement between the programmes of social research

stemming from these interpretations, are being discussed again in the contemporary critique of social biology.[63]

The topicality, and theoretical and practical significance of this problem have arisen in connection with the fact that the latest advances of biology, in particular of genetics, are creating conditions for investigating diverse concrete forms of the interaction of the biological and the social in the development and life of man and society. Under the present second industrial revolution the very complex task of the optimum combination of society's scientific and technological, and production activity, with processes taking place in the biosphere is again being posed.

Notes

[1] Wilhelm Ostwald. *Energetische Grundlagen der Kulturwissenschaft* (Klinkhardt, Leipzig, 1909).

[2] Cited from: Lucien Febvre. *La terre et l'évolution humaine. Introduction géographique à l'histoire* (La Renaissance du livre, Paris, 1922), p 12.

[3] Henry T. Buckle. *History of Civilisation in England* (Appleton, New York, 1862).

[4] Karl Ritter. *Die Erdkunde im Verhältniss zur Natur und zur Geschichte des Menschen oder allgemeine, vergleichende Geographie*. 21 Vols. (G. Reimer, Berlin, 1822-1859).

[5] Friedrich Ratzel. *Die Erde und das Lieben*. Vol. 1 (Bibliographisches Institut, Leipzig, 1901); *Anthropogeographie*. 2 Vols. (J. Engelhorn, Stuttgart, 1891-1899); *Politische Geographie*, 3rd ed. (Munich, 1923).

[6] Karl Haushofer. *Erdkunde, Geopolitik und Wehrwissenschaft* (Hueber, Munich, 1934).

[7] See Günter Heyden. *Kritik der deutschen Geopolitik* (Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1958).

[8] Rudolf Kjellén. *Der Staat als Lebensform* (Vowinckel, Berlin, 1924).

[9] Ellen C. Semple. *Influences of Geographic Environment on the Basis of Ratzel's System of Anthropo-Geography* (Constable & Co., London, 1937).

[10] Ellsworth Huntington. *Civilization and Climate* (Yale U.P., New

Haven, Conn., 1924); *The Character of Races as Influenced by Physical Environment, Natural Selection and Historical Development* (Scribner's Sons, New York, 1925); *Mainsprings of Civilization*, (Chapman & Hall, London, 1945).

[11] Camille Vallaux. *Géographie sociale: le sol et l'état* (Octave Doin et Fils., Paris, 1911).

[12] Paul Mougeolle. *Statique des civilizations* (Leroux, Paris, 1883).

[13] A. L. Chizhevsky. *Fizicheskie faktory istoricheskogo protsessa* (Physical Factors of History), (Kaluga, 1924).

[14] John A. Stewart, William Warntz. Macrogeography and Social Science. In: *The Geographical Review*, 1958, *48*, 2: 167-184.

[15] Environment and Cultural Behaviour. Ecological Studies. In: Andrew P. Vayda (Ed.). *Cultural Anthropology* (The Natural History Press, Garden City, N.Y., 1969).

[16] Paul Vidal de la Blache. *Principes de géographie humaine* (Librarie Armand Colin, Paris, 1922).

[17] Elisée Reclus. *L'homme et la terre*, 6 vols. (Librairie universelle, Paris, 1905-1908); L. I. Mechnikov. *Tsivilizatsiya i velikie istoricheskie reki* (Civilisation and the Great Historical Rivers), (Moscow, 1927).

[18] George Tatham. Environmentalism and Possibilism. In: Griffith Taylor (Ed.). *Geography in the Twentieth Century. A Study of Growth, Fields, Techniques, Aims and Trends* (Methuen, London, 1957), pp 128-162.

[19] David Harvey. *Explanation in Geography* (Arnold, London, 1969).

[20] H. S. Chamberlain. *Die Grundlagen des 19 Jahrhunderts*, 1899.

[21] Houston S. Chamberlain. *Arische Weltanschauung* (Bruckmann, Munich, 1912).

[22] Hugo Meyer. *Houston Stewart Chamberlain als völkischer Denker* (Bruckmann, Munich, 1939).

[23] Georges Vacher de Lapouge. *Race et milieu social* (Librairie des sciences politiques et sociales, Paris, 1909), pp VIII, 172.

[24] *Ibid.*, p VII.

[25] Georges Vacher de Lapouge. *Les sélections sociales* (A. Fontemoing, Paris, 1896).

[26] G. Vacher de Lapouge. *Race et milieu social*, p. 233.

[27] *Ibid.*, pp 206-211.

[28] Otto Ammon. *Die Gesellschaftsordnung und Ihre Natürlichen Grundlagen* (Fischer, Jena, 1896).

[29] G. Vacher de Lapouge. *Race et milieu social*, p 212.

[30] Tadeusz Szczurkiewicz. *Studia Socjologiczne* (Państw. Wyd-wo nauk, Warsaw, 1970).

[31] Judith E. Schlanger. *Les métaphores de l'organisme* (Librairie Vrin, Paris, 1971).

[32] Réné Worms. *Organisme et société* (Giard et Brière, Paris, 1896).

[33] Guillaume de Greef. *Le transformisme social. Essai sur le progrès et le regrès des sociétés* (Felix Alcan, Paris, 1895).

[34] Albert Schäffle. Die geistanstaltlichen Grundverknüpfungen. In: Werner Sombart (Ed.). *Soziologie* (Pan-Verlag Rolf Heise, Berlin, 1923), pp 60-75.

[35] Albert Schäffle. *Bau und Leben des sozialen Körpers.* 4 Vols. (Laupp, Tübingen, 1881).

[36] Réné Worms. *Organism et société* (Paris, 1895).

[37] Réné Worms. *La sociologie. Sa nature, son contenu, ses attaches* (Marcel Giard, Paris, 1926).

[38] Alfred Fouillée. *La science sociale contemporaine* (Hachette et C[ie]., Paris, 1880).

[39] Alfred Espinas. *Des sociétés animales. Études de psychologie comparée* (Baillière, Paris, 1877).

[40] Michele Angelo Vaccaro. *La lotta per l'esistenza e i suoi effetti nell'umanità* (Tib. Tiberina di F. Setth, Rome, 1886).

[41] Walter Bagehot. Physics and Politics. In: *The Works of Walter Bagehot*, Vol. 4 (The Travellers Insurance Co., Hartford, Conn., 1891), p 442.

[42] *Ibid.*, p 457.

[43] Louis Gumplowicz. *La lutte des races. Recherches sociologiques* (Guillaumin et C[ie]., Paris, 1893), p 349.

[44] *Ibid.*, p 193.

[45] Gustav Ratzenhofer. *Die soziologische Erkenntnis. Positive Philosophie des socialen Lebens* (Brockhaus, Leipzig, 1898), pp 244-250.

[46] Albion W. Small. *General Sociology. An Exposition of the Main Development in Sociological Theory from Spencer to Ratzenhofer* (The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1905), p 426.

[47] *Ibid.*, pp 433-434.

[48] *Ibid.*, p 433.

[49] *Ibid.*, pp 434-435.

[50] *Ibid.*, p 552.

[51] Albion W. Small. *The Meaning of Social Science* (The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1910), pp 79-80.

[52] Albion W. Small. *General Sociology*, p 15; *idem. The Meaning of Social Science*, p 160.

[53] Albion W. Small. *General Sociology*, p 34.

[54] See W. S. Sumner. *War and Other Essays* (Yale U.P., New Haven, Conn., 1911).

[55] Richard Hofstadter. *Social Darwinism in American Thought* (The Beacon Press, Boston, Mass., 1955), p 66.

[56] W. G. Sumner. *Folkways. A Study of the Sociological Importance of Usages, Manners, Customs, Mores, and Morals* (Dover Publications, New York, 1959), p 3.

[57] *Ibid*., p 18.

[58] *Ibid*., p 4.

[59] *Ibid*., p 13.

[60] Nicholas S. Timasheff. *Sociological Theory. Its Nature and Growth* (Doubleday & Co., Garden City, N.Y., 1955).

[61] Pierre L. Van den Berghe. *Man in Society. A Biosocial View* (Elsevier, New York, 1975); Edward O. Wilson. *Sociobiology. The New Synthesis* (Harvard Univ. Press, Cambridge (Mass.), 1975).

[62] C. D. Darlington. *The Evolution of Man and Society* (Simon and Schuster, New York, 1969); François Jacob. *La logique du vivant. Une histoire de l'hérédité* (Gallimard, Paris, 1971).

[63] Walter Hollitscher. *Aggression in Menschenbild. Marx, Freud, Lorenz* (Globus, Vienna, 1979).

5

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL SOCIOLOGY OF THE TURN OF THE CENTURY

Igor Kon

1. Psychology and Sociology in the Nineteenth Century

The crisis of biological, naturalistic theories at the end of the nineteenth century promoted a strengthening of the psychological trend in sociology. The idea of reducing the social to the psychological was not, of course, new. Locke and Hume, the French Enlightenment, and the English Utilitarians had cited the 'universal laws of psychology' and the 'properties of human nature'. John Stuart Mill asserted, in polemics against Comte, that all social laws were reducible to 'laws of individual human nature'.

> Men are not, when brought together, converted into another kind of substance, with different properties; ... Human beings in society have no properties but those which are derived from, and may be resolved into, the laws of the nature of individual man.[1]

Sociology, therefore, as the science 'of the actions of collective masses of mankind, and the various phenomena which constitute social life', had its own base in psychology.[2]

As we have seen, biology also served only as a *methodological* model (organic analogy, the principle of evolution, etc.) for many naturalistic conceptions, while their *meaningful*

premisses rested on 'everyday' psychology'. The birth of the experimental psychology, and its institutionalisation as an independent discipline separate from both philosophy and physiology, raised its academic prestige and encouraged spread of psychologism in other branches of knowledge. While psychology had been considered a simple concretisation of philosophy in the early nineteenth century, Wilhelm Wundt (1832-1920), the founder of experimental psychology, endeavoured to alter that attitude, claiming that all the philosophy of his day was modern psychology.

At the end of the century *psychologism*, as a general trend toward psychological substantiation of scientific knowledge and explanation of the most diverse phenomena, became widespread. Psychological substantiation of epistemology, logic, aesthetics, linguistics, history, literary studies, and other disciplines became the academic fashion. Psychologism was a characteristic feature of the 'second positivism' (Machism, empiriocriticism). Sociology, too, did not escape this epidemic.

The psychology of the early nineteenth century was exclusively that of the individual and did not take social processes into account.

The position changed in the last third of the century. On the one hand, psychologists discovered that it was impossible to reduce higher psychic functions to physiological processes, and that these required complex social factors to be taken into account. On the other hand, sociologists, who were not satisfied with primitive biological, organic analogies, evinced a growing interest in problems of motivation and the psychological mechanisms of social behaviour. The merging of these two opposite movements formed, as a result, what we conventionally call the psychological trend in sociology.

Like other trends in ideas of that period, psychological sociology was by no means a single whole. The sole feature that constituted it as a trend was a striving, not always conscious, to reduce the social to the psychological. But that was expressed by various authors with unequal force, while the type of psychology they appealed to was not the same. Certain more or less independent ramifications can be seen, depending on the problems advanced and the explanatory categories: psychological evolutionism; instinctivism; 'folk psychology',

closely linked with ethnography; group psychology; and interactionism which made interpersonal relations the primary unit of sociological research.

2. Psychological Evolutionism

Psychological explanation of social processes did not necessitate an immediate break with the ideas of the biological, evolutionary school. Originally it was a matter only of 'supplementing' the evolutionary scheme by study of the psychological mechanisms of the development and functioning of society. These mechanisms themselves, moreover, were treated in a very broad, amorphous way. The spokesmen of psychological evolutionism, the American sociologists Lester Ward (1841-1913) and Franklin Giddings (1855-1931), following Spencer, regarded the development of society as part of cosmic evolution, each successive stage of which accumulated the advances of the preceding ones. But, whereas the proponents of the biological orientation considered social evolution a direct continuation and part of the organic, and stressed the features of automatism in it, the psychoevolutionists saw in the more complex forms of social life a result of the development of conscious element, putting forward, in contrast to Spencer's *laissez-faire*, a slogan of purposive evolution, or rational control of social processes.

Lester F. Ward was a geologist and palaeobotanist by profession, who turned to sociology in his mature years. His main works were: *Dynamic Sociology* (1883), *Psychic Factors of Civilization* (1893), *Outlines of Sociology* (1898), *Pure Sociology* (1903), *Applied Sociology* (1906), and *Textbook of Sociology* (1905) in collaboration with J.Q. Dealey. In 1906 he was elected the first president of the American Sociological Society. Ward's ideas were not particularly original. He considered that the Spencerian principle of cosmic evolution should be supplemented as regards man by the value idea of progress. Social institutions were the result of the development of psychic forces rather than of vital ones. 'The social forces are the psychic forces as they operate in the collective state of man.'[3] From that it followed that psychology should be the foundation of sociology, and not biology as with Spencer. Sociogenesis

was the highest rung on the evolutionary ladder, a synthesis of all natural forces formed during cosmogenesis, biogenesis, and anthropogenesis. The qualitative difference of this new, social reality was the existence of emotion and aim, which did not exist in the actions of blind natural forces. These new factors gradually altered genetic natural processes that lacked aim into telestic ones (from Gr. *tele*–end) or, what is the same thing, into social processes with the form of man's purposive action.

Ward developed a view in his main work *Dynamic Sociology* and several others that the primary social force was desires (in particular hunger and thirst) connected with maintenance of the individual's life, and sexual desires which ensured continuation of the species. More complex intellectual, moral, and aesthetic desires were built up on the basis of these primary ones, by which he tried to explain the progressive development of society and its 'improvement' (the principle of 'meliorism').

Apart from individual end-posing Ward recognised the existence of 'collective telesis', the agent of which was the state. Social consciousness could not yet, at that time, he suggested, neutralise forces harmful for society, like private monopolies, whose activity he equated with robbery. But competition and monopoly must yield in the future to conscious co-operation. Ward's petty-bourgeois democratic spirit, and his diatribes against monopolies, repeatedly drew the anger of reactionaries down onto him. In fact, however, he did not encroach on the foundations of capitalism at all in defending the principle of peaceful elimination of class inequality and of attainment of universal harmony; his ideas were frankly eclectic.

Eclecticism also characterised the opinions of Giddings, the founder in 1894 of the first chair of sociology (in Columbia University). His chief books were *The Principles of Sociology* (1896), the textbook *The Elements of Sociology* (1898), *Inductive Sociology* (1901), *Studies in the Theory of Human Society* (1922), and *The Scientific Theory of Human Society* (1924).

According to him sociology is 'a science that tries to conceive of society in its unity, and attempts to explain it in terms of cosmic cause and law'.[4] While arguing about the equilibrium of energy and constancy of force quite in the spirit of Spencer,

Giddings made it precise, however, that society was not simply an organism but 'an *organization*' that arose partly as a consequence of 'unconscious evolution, partly as a result of conscious planning'.[5] It was 'a psychical organism essentially', according to him, 'but with a physical basis'.[6] Sociology, therefore, 'must combine the subjective and the objective interpretations'.[7] He himself concentrated on the subjective, psychological aspect.

'The original and elementary subjective fact in society,' Giddings held, was '*the consciousness* of kind', i.e., a 'state of consciousness in which any being, whether low or high in the scale of life, recognizes another conscious being as of like kind with itself'.[8]

Consciousness of kind or, as Giddings sometimes called this phenomenon, 'the Social Mind', meant the spiritual unity of rational beings, which made their conscious relationship with one another possible while preserving the individuality of each. In essence it was a matter of group and collective consciousness whose products were public opinion, cultural traditions, collective moods, and social values. Giddings did not, however, delimit the content of social consciousness and the psychic processes and mechanisms by which the relationships of individuals were realised.

In his later works, written after World War I, he partly revised his original positions. In trying to combine them with the then popular behaviourism, and stressing the significance of quantitative methods in sociology, he asserted that sociology was a 'science statistical in method'.[9] That allows the historian to consider him one of the heralds of neopositivism in American sociology.[10] On the whole, however, his influence on American sociology was due, rather, to his administrative possibilities.

3. Instinctivism

The psychological evolutionism of Ward and Giddings did not leave much of a mark on the history of sociological thought. Instinctivism proved to be much more influential. The problem of 'social instincts' did not arise in the nineteenth century by chance. By painting society in the image and likeness of the individual, nineteenth-century psychology endeavoured to find

an inner personal psychic determinant or number of determinants that could simultaneously explain both individual and group behaviour.

The tradition of the Enlightenment had relied predominantly on a 'rational' model of man, deducing his behaviour from a rational reckoning and considerations of utility. The Romantics, on the contrary, stressed the emotional, instinctive principle, the influence of biological, irrational factors. The rationalism of the Enlightenment, with its naive optimism, was seriously compromised when the 'realm of reason' to which it appealed turned out to be more like Hobbes' 'war of everyone against everyone'. Irrationalism greatly increased in the philosophy of the late nineteenth century, and a tendency to explain human behaviour mainly by irrational, unconscious impulses, be it Max Stirner's 'egoism' or Nietzsche's 'will to power'. Biology, by disclosing the mechanisms of animals' instinctive actions, seemed to provide this trend with a natural-science basis. Experimental studies of the human psyche also revealed the existence of powerful unconscious processes and structures in it. T. A. Ribot laid the foundations of experimental study of emotions. The psychologists of the Wurzburg School introduced the concept of attitude, a state of consciousness, indeterminate and not readily amenable to analysis, that controlled the choice and dynamics of mental operations and impressions. Study of hypnotic states and psychopathology also brought scholars up against the problem of the unconscious.

Taken together all that encouraged a frequent interpreting of social phenomena at the end of the nineteenth century in terms of 'instincts', 'drives', and 'impulses'. The concept 'instinct' was used in that connection in a broad, general, everyday sense, signifying both the biological needs of the organism and inherited programmes of behaviour and, even, simply desires. Group, 'social' instincts were also written about, as well as the individual's biological instincts. Giddings, for example, advised treating his conception of consciousness of kind as a developed form of the theory of instincts.

William McDougall (1871-1938), an English psychologist who worked in the United States from 1921, and the author of the very popular *An Introduction to Social Psychology* (1908), is considered the foremost spokesman of instinctivism. In his

view the 'psychology of instincts' was the theoretical foundation of all the social sciences. He understood by instinct an innate or natural psychophysical predisposition that compelled the individual to perceive or pay attention to certain objects and thereby experience a specific emotional stimulation, and to act in a certain way or, at least, to experience a stimulus to so act, in regard to that object. A definite emotion corresponded to each primary instinct, according to him, and this emotion, like the instinct itself, was simple and indivisible. To the instinct of flight, for instance, there corresponded an emotion of fear, to the instinct of curiosity an emotion of wonder, to the instinct of pugnacity an emotion of anger, to the parental instinct an emotion of gentleness, and so on.

In extending his theory to society, McDougall put a definite instinct, or group of instincts, under every social phenomenon. He explained war, for instance, by people's predisposition to pugnacity, and the accumulation of social wealth to an inclination to money-grubbing and miserliness. Religion was based on a combination of the instincts of curiosity, self-humiliation, and flight taken together with the emotional reactions intrinsic in the parental instinct. He attached very great social significance to the herd instinct that held people together and underlay most of the institutions of society. A direct manifestation of the herd instinct was the growth of towns, the collective character of human leisure, mass gatherings, etc.

The success of McDougall's book, which was reprinted many times, stimulated the appearance of many followers. The English surgeon Wilfred Trotter (1872-1939) became famous for a book in which he claimed that all social phenomena were ultimately explainable by 'herd instincts'. The English Fabian socialist Graham Wallas (1858-1932) extended psychological analysis to the sphere of politics, paying special attention to the instinct of loyalty, which ensured the functioning of state power.[12] The Austrian psychiatrist Sigmund Freud (1856-1939) considered sexual desire, or libido, the universal determinant of human behaviour. From study of neuroses and the inner conflicts of the individual psyche, he subsequently, beginning with his *Totem and Taboo* (1913), extended his theory also to the history of culture. Later, on the basis of the experience of World War I, he was already speaking of a struggle of

two principles of the human psyche—Eros, or the instinct of life, and Thanatos, or the unconscious desire for death (death wish or death instinct).

Instinctivism had a definite influence on the science of man by drawing attention to the unconscious components of the psyche and also by its polemic against behaviourism. But its own theoretical basis was more than unstable. Instinctivism replaced social, historical regularities by individual, psychological ones, and tried to give the latter a biological foundation. Not only the content, but also the number of 'basic instincts' varied from one author to another. McDougall named 11 at first, then 14, and finally 18, which he later renamed 'inclinations' under the impact of criticism by behaviourists. William James reckoned them at 38; Freud reduced them to two. When Lister Bernard[13] analysed the meaning of this term in the literature, he counted 15,789 separate instincts, which condensed into 6,131 instincts of independent 'essence'. Precepts, habits, needs, affects, and psychic processes figured under to term 'instincts'.

It is not surprising that, as sociology and psychology developed, the influence of instinctivist theories rapidly died away. The exception was Freudism, but its influence on sociology came later in time, so that I shall not discuss it here.

4. Folk Psychology

All the theories I have named looked for a very simple 'cell' of social behaviour in the psyche of the *individual*, and in that sense were subjective idealist. But in nineteenth-century science there was also an objective idealist treatment of social consciousness, which had its ideological roots in Hegel's theory of the 'objective spirit' and the German Romantics' conception of the 'folk spirit'. These conceptions were based not so much on psychology as on the history of language and literature, and especially folklore, which convincingly demonstrated the existence of certain stable, repeated elements and structures of a supraindividual character in the development of culture. What was the nature of this 'fold spirit', or 'national character'? The Romantics interpreted it in an objective idealist, substan-

tional sense, as a special mental or spiritual reality. But the concept gradually acquired another, naturalist content.

The German scientists Moritz Lazarus (1824-1903) and Heymann Steinthal (1823-1899), having made a synthesis of the data of linguistic and ethnography with the psychological theory of J. F. Herbart, announced in 1860 the creation of a new discipline 'folk psychology'. According to Steinthal, all individuals of a nation (folk) bore the impress of its special nature on their bodies and minds, because of the unity of their origin and habitat, the effect of the bodily influences on the mind, moreover, evoking certain bents, tendencies, predispositions, and properties of the mind, identical for all of them, as a consequence of which they all possessed an identical folk spirit. He understood folk spirit as the psychic similarity of the individuals belonging to a certain nation, and at the same time as their self-awareness; the content of the folk spirit was disclosed through study of language, myths, morals, and culture in the context of the historical psychology of peoples and psychological ethnology.

Although Steinthal and Lazarus could not fulfil this programme, their ideas were taken up and developed by Wilhelm Wundt. In his opinion physiological psychology did not embrace the true content of mature consciousness. Higher psychic processes, above all thinking, were the result of the development of a community of people, and should therefore be studied by a special science. He objected to his predecessors' direct analogy of the individual and folk consciousness. Just as the consciousness of the individual was not reducible to the initial elements of sensation and feeling, but was a creative synthesis of them, so folk consciousness was a creative synthesis of individual consciousnesses, through which a new reality arose that was discoverable in the products of suprapersonal activity, i.e., language, myths, and morals. Wundt devoted the last 20 years of his life to investigating them; the results of this work were embodied in the ten volumes of his *Völkerspsychologie* (Folk Psychology).

Like his predecessors Wundt did not manage to fulfil his programme. The historical, cultural, and ethnographic material did not fit into the simple psychological schemes, the more so that Wundt, wanting to demonstrate the universality of the

laws of physiological psychology, in fact tried to subordinate the supraindividual reality of the folk spirit to them. In one of his works he wrote that it had been ruled out from the very beginning that any universal laws appeared in folk psychology that were not already fully contained in the laws of individual consciousness.[14] He treated the separate forms of social consciousness as 'psychological' and not as 'socio-logical' phenomena. He thus brought out the laws of language by analogy with the laws of the association of notions, myths as the result of the processing of notions by emotions, and morals as a consequence of the inclusion of will among the primary elements of consciousness.

Folk Psychology was one of the first attempts to conceptualise and begin a concrete study of the interaction of culture and individual consciousness. The orientation to bringing together psychological, ethnographic, linguistic, historical-philological, and anthropological research was itself above all valuable. Historical psychology, cultural anthropology, ethnopsychology, and even sociolinguistics and psycholinguistics find their sources, not without grounds, in the *Völkerpsychologie.* But its influence on sociology seems to have been minimal. The theoretical problem of the relation of culture and individual consciousness remained fundamentally unresolved in it, while the descriptive material actually had nothing in common with the explanatory conceptions.

5. Group Psychology and the Theory of Imitation

At the end of the nineteenth century it had become increasingly clear that neither the psychology of the individual nor the abstract 'folk spirit' could provide the key to inderstanding social phenomena. Hence the mounting interest in direct study of phenomena of group and mass behaviour and the psychological and social mechanisms that made possible *transmission* of social norms and beliefs, and *adaptation* of individuals to one another.

The interest of sociologists in the psychology of the masses also had its ideological sources. The ruling classes, terrified by the revolutionary actions of the working people in 1789,

1830, and 1848, saw a terrible, destructive force in the masses. The Romantic traditionalists of the early nineteenth century warned that the turning of society into a mass society entailed death of creative individuality and culture. The actions of the Parisian proletariat in 1848 and 1871 strengthened that mood even more. In the second half of the century ideas about the irrationality of the masses became very common both in positivist philosophy (Taine, especially in his treatment of the French Revolution) and an antipositivist philosophy (Nietzsche). The Italian criminologist Scipio Sighele (1868-1913) gave this idea a pseudoscientific psychological substantiation in his *La folla criminale* (The Criminal Crowd) (1891) and *La psychologie des sectes* (Psychology of Sects) (1895). Man, he wrote, was brutal and criminal by nature. The weakening of rational self-control inevitable in a crowd, unleashed those instincts, heightening the individual's suggestibility and his receptivity to any evil.

At the turn of the century the books of the French publicist, Gustave Le Bon (1841-1931), a doctor by training, became very popular: *La psychologie des foules* (The Psychology of Crowds) (1895) and *Les lois psychologiques de l'évolution des peuples* (The Psychological Laws of the Evolution of Peoples) (1894). In his opinion European society was entering a new period of development, the 'crowd age' in which the rational critical principle embodied in the individual would be overwhelmed by irrational mass consciousness. The 'crowd' or 'the mass' was a group of people gathered together in one place, inspired by common feelings, and ready to follow its leader wherever he liked. No rational force could control the violent impulses of mass consciousness. Le Bon stressed that the course of each person's thought in a crowd was directed by its common mood. The longer a person remained in a crowd, the weaker his feeling of reality became and the more he became subject to the influence of the leader. People were often found among the leaders with sharply expressed features of psychic deviations. Le Bon sharply condemned any revolutionary movement, especially socialism from that position.

> Knowledge of the psychology of crowds is a resource of the statesman who wants not to govern them—that has become very

difficult today—but at least not to be too completely governed by them.[15]

The theoretical problems posed by Le Bon—the anonymity, psychological contagion, and the suggestibility of the 'crowd man'—gave an impulse to serious social psychological studies. But his theory was reactionary and scientifically unsound on the whole, above all his identification of the masses of the people and the irrational 'mob'. His 'ideal crowd', i.e., a completely chance, amorphous gathering of individuals, was seldom encountered in practice, in any case as a socially significant force, and not just as a simple street crowd of idlers; the latter was the most elementary, and the lowest, possibly, initial form of all of socio-psychological entity. Modern social psychologists note a number of other flaws in Le Bon's conceptions: the extremely blurred character of his basic concepts; the unsubstantiated counterposing of the irrational mob to an idealised image of the rational individual; the substitution of terms, as a consequence of which observations of the behaviour of criminal gangs were extrapolated onto qualitatively different forms of group behaviour; the arbitrary postulate of the 'collective spirit'; the unsystematic character of the proofs, which served rather as illustrations of an a priori thesis.[16]

The group psychology of the turn of the century was not just speculative constructs of that type. Not only was the amorphous 'crowd' studied, but also concrete human groups, diads and triads, and also such processes of interpersonal relationship as mental contagion, suggestion, and imitation.

This orientation drew inspiration from very diverse sources, including experimental studies of hypnosis, observations of the imitative activity of children, ethnological studies, and observations of such phenomena as fashion or panic. The first studies of this kind were not distinguished by either methodological or conceptual rigour. Some authors (N. K. Mikhailovsky) were inclined to consider mental contagion as a fundamental process underlying people's uniform social behaviour in groups; others (V. M. Bekhterev, Gustave Le Bon) assigned this role to suggestion; others still (Gabriel de Tarde, J. M. Baldwin) gave preference to imitation. The relation of these processes was also defined differently. Whereas Vigouroux and

Juquelier considered mental contagion a form of imitation,[17] Le Bon, on the contrary, saw in it a partial case of mental contagion. In all cases, however, the object of study was group processes, which were assigned a specific methodological and ontological status.

The outstanding figure of this school was the French lawyer and sociologist Gabriel de Tarde (1843-1904), author of *Criminalité comparée* (1886), *Les lois de l'imitation* (1890), *Logique sociale* (1895), *Les lois sociales* (1898), *Etudes de psychologie sociale* (1898), *L'opinion et la foule* (1901), *Psychologie économique* (1902). Apart from philosophers and sociologists (among them Montesquieu, Comte, Spencer, Mill, and Cournot), the Italian criminalist school (Cesare Lombroso, Raffaele Garofalo, Enrico Ferri, and others) had a marked influence on his views. But in opposition to these Italians, who traced crime from racial and geographical conditions, Trade attached decisive importance to its social and psychological factors.

For many years Tarde waged a bitter polemic against his junior contemporary and intellectual rival Emile Durkheim. Both thinkers had risen from polemics against bio-organic theories and utilitarianism; both attached great significance to ethnographic data and the comparative method; both were interested in the nature of social standards, seeing in them the force that integrated society. But behind this similarity there were profound differences. For Durkheim society was a social system *sui generis*, a product of which was the separate individual.

Tarde, on the contrary, spoke from the standpoint of nominalism; for him society was only a product of the interactions of individuals. He considered any analogies between society and a biological organism or mechanical aggregate to be fruitless. Consciousness, according to him, was a postulate of mechanics. He also rejected the evolutionist model of society. The trouble with sociology, according to him, was that it confused 'laws of society' and 'laws of history'; but the first were essentially laws of the *reproduction* of phenomena, while the second were laws of their *development*. They were two different classes of laws; the laws of history, moreover, were much more complex, and could only be formulated from the laws of society.

Hence he substituted an analytical approach for the evolu-

tionary one. Sociology was 'simply ... collective psychology',[18] which should answer two questions.

> Sociology, as just defined, must attack two major problems: 1. What is the cause of inventions, of successful initiatives, of the social *adaptations* analogous to and no less obscure in their origin than biological adaptations? 2. Why were these initiatives imitated, and not others? Why was the preference accorded to such and such a model, among so many others which did not find any imitators? In other words, what are the laws of imitation?[19]

Tarde consistently rejected every attempt to postulate the existence of independent spiritual entities of the type of 'group consciousness' or 'spirit of the crowd', considering such doctrines survivals of mysticism. But he could not base sociology either on the principles of individualist psychology. If the various 'I's' were completely heterogeneous and had nothing in common with one another, how could they transmit or communicate anything to each other? And how could they associate and form an 'ourself', a 'we' (un 'nous')?

> Collective psychology, inter-mental psychology, that is, sociology, is thus possible only because individual psychology, intra-mental psychology, includes elements which can be transmitted and communicated from one consciousness to others, elements which, despite the irreducible hiatus between individuals, are capable of uniting and joining together in order to form true social forces and quantities, currents of opinion or popular impulses, traditions of national customs.[20]

The elementary social relation, according to Tarde, was the transmission, or attempt to transmit, a belief or wish. The simplest model of that was the state of hypnotic sleep. 'Society is imitation, and imitation is a kind of somnambulism.'[21]

Any innovation, he considered, was the product of individual creative work, the sole source of which was a creative act of the imagination of a gifted individual. Successful adaptation of the innovation gave rise to a wave of repetitions taking the form of 'imitation'. Tarde drew a schematic picture of the way an innovation was spread by imitation in the form of concentric

circles spreading from the centre. The circle of imitation had a tendency to spread endlessly until it ran into an approaching wave coming from another centre. The streams of imitation coming from opposite directions began to struggle, repetition gave way to opposition, and a 'logical duel' of imitations began. Any conflict, from a theoretical dispute to a war, could be a particular case of this. Logical duels could have various results, but a new adaptation somehow succeeded opposition, and the whole cycle of social processes was renewed.

Tarde divided the basic laws of sociology, which embraced all three basic social processes (adaptation, repetition, and opposition), into the logical and the extralogical. Logical laws explained why one innovation spread and another did not, how the need for a certain innovation matured, whether it was compatible with already existing knowledge and notions (logical union) or conflicted with it (logical duel). Extralogical laws showed how the process of imitation proceeded; for example, that it went from a centre to the periphery, from the highest to the lowest, from ends to means, etc.

Although Tarde built his theory as a deductive one, he attached immense importance to empirical methods of investigation. In his opinion sociology had two chief methods at its disposal—the archaeological and the statistical. The archaeological method (it will be readily recognised as a description of the historical method) was based on analysis of historical documents and was used to study periods and areas of the spread of concrete innovations and models. The statistical method was employed to gather information about current processes of imitation by way of computing similar imitative acts and plotting imitative flow spread curves. Analysis of the statistics of suicides, crimes, railway traffic, and trade made it possible to find a quantitative expression of the imitative force of an innovation, and to bring out the favourable or unfavourable consequences of its spread, and ultimately to bring spontaneous, elemental social (imitative) processes under control. Tarde saw the highroad for the development of sociology in broad application of 'number and measure' to the study of society. His socio-statistical studies, in particular on matters of crime, enjoyed great authority among his contemporaries.

The most important sphere he applied his theoretical theses

to was public opinion and 'crowd psychology'. His book *L'opinion et la foule* recalls Le Bon in its range of ideas and concepts, but Tarde criticised the concept of a substantial 'collective mind' existing outside or above the consciousness of individuals. He also did not agree with the claim that the twentieth century would be the 'mob age'. In his opinion it would rather be the age of the public or publics, which was quite another matter.

In his description of 'crowds' and 'criminal sects' Tarde, like his predecessors, stressed the irrationality, imitativeness, and need for leaders. But he turned his main attention not to that but to the process of the differentiation of public opinion and of the forming of a public on that basis. In contrast to the crowd, the psychic unity of which was primarily created by physical contact, a public was

> a purely spiritual collectivity, a dissemination of physically separate individuals, whose cohesion is wholly mental.[22]

> Opinion is to the public, in modern times, what the soul is to the body.[23]

By approaching the problem simultaneously in an analytical and a historical way, Tarde traced the stages of the forming of the public, considering it a product of modern times. The prehistory of the public was in the salons and clubs of the eighteenth century, but its real history began with the appearance of newspapers. While the individual personality was levelled in the crowd, it got a chance of self-expression in the public. Perfecting of the means of communion in it also furthered complication and enrichment of the personality, the more so that there was not just one public in a society but several different types.

Tarde did not limit himself to these general considerations but gave a very precise psychological analysis of the different forms of mass communication and interpersonal communion, in particular conversation. His observations largely anticipated the later development of the mass communication theory and the psychology of intercourse. When one appraises his activity as a whole, one must say that he promoted the posing and study

of many important problems. Together with George Simmel he brought the matter of interpersonal relationships and its socio-psychological mechanisms to the centre of scientific investigation. He is rightly regarded one of the founders of social psychology as a science. The analytical approach that he substantiated, his critique of evolutionism, and his interest in ecology and technology, were also very important for the history of sociology. His direct influence in France was comparatively slight, but his ideas got broad recognition in the USA. J. M. Baldwin, who had reached practically the same conclusions independently of him, relying on the data of genetic psychology, called Tarde one of the most authoritative and outstanding contemporary authors in sociology and social psychology. Franz Boas (1858-1942), the head of the cultural-historical trend in American anthropology, considered *The Laws of Imitation* an outstanding book. The conception of one of the leading US psychosociologists, Edward Ross, were largely shaped by the influence of Tarde.

But the reduction of sociology to 'intermental psychology' in the end led up a blind alley, since the researcher lost sight of the macrosocial structure within which, and under whose influence, interpersonal relations were shaped and moulded. Although Tarde paid great attention to technology in his classification of inventions and innovations, material relations were partly dissolved in mental ones with him.

Having limited the social process to a context of mental relationships, Tarde could not escape from the logical circle in his interpretation of them. He deduced the individual's psychology and behaviour from imitation of external models and innovations, and treated them, in turn, as the product of the creative acitivity of individuals. He did not in general examine the origin of models for imitation *sociologically*. Their source was a creative act of the individual's imagination, while 'the laws of invention belong essentially to individual logic'.[24]

Such obvious idealism shocked even such a spokesman of 'subjective sociology' as N. K. Mikhailovsky, who wrote, not without irony, that

> the moments that prepare a sharp display of moral contagion are reduced, only slowly and quietly, for Tarde to this moral contagion,

which is expressed in propaganda and the mastery of new ideas. The events marked by the ideas of Luther and Müntzer occurred in history not because the oppression of the feudal, Catholic system became intolerable, but because Luther's ideas spread.[25]

The *psychological* content of the 'theory of imitation' was also subjected to serious criticism. Wundt had already drawn attention to the vagueness of this concept, which was more often than not a vulgar psychological description of an associative process unlike imitation in the proper sense of the term. Durkheim pointed out that

> one cannot designate by the same term the process by virtue of which a collective sentiment takes shape within a certain group of men, that from which our sticking to general or traditional rules of conduct results, and finally that which drives the sheep of Panurge to threw themselves into the water because one of them has begun to. It is another matter to feel in common, another thing to bow to the authority of opinion, and another thing, finally, to automatically repeat what others have done.[26]

Many of the 'laws' formulated by Tarde were also problematic. The thesis that imitation proceeded 'from the internal to the external' was connected with a theory that arrived at an act of behaviour from conscious motives. But imitation or the assimilation of a new model often began from external, superficial features, and consciousness came only subsequently in an already established expressive form. The 'law' that imitation always flowed 'from top to bottom', from the ruling classes to the oppressed, though supported by many facts, was also not universal, because it rested on an idea of the inevitability of a stratified system of society; it is well known that many innovations in the sphere of culture arose first among the oppressed, and were later assimilated by the dominant classes (suffice it to recall Christianity).

The theory of imitation went beyond the framework of intra-mental processes, making the object and unit of sociological research the process of interpersonal relationships and not the

individual taken separately. But as we have just seen, it understood this relationship in an even more external and mechanical way.

6. The Birth of Interactionism

The interactionist orientation that arose in the USA was an attempt to overcome this weakness by combining psychologism with organicism. It was centred on the *interaction* of individuals. The individual person who figured as the subject of this interaction was understood not as an abstract individual but as a social being belonging to definite social groups and performing a certain social role. The counterposing of the individual to society gave way to the idea of their interpenetration.

The idea was not new philosophically, of course. Its first embodiment in psychology was the theory of William James (1842-1910). Defining the content of the Empirical Self as 'all that he is tempted to call by the name of me', James distinguished three elements in it: (1) 'the material self', including the body, clothing, family, and property; (2) 'the social self', i. e., the recognition the individual received from his surroundings; our surroundings being heterogeneous, one may say that man possesses as many different social selves as there exist different groups of people, whose opinion he appreciates; (3) 'the spiritual self', i.e., the aggregate of his mental, spiritual capacities and inclinations.[27]

The inclusion of social moments in the structure of the personality and its self-awareness was very fruitful. The next step in that direction was taken by one of the founders of modern genetic psychology James Mark Baldwin (1861-1934), the author of *Mental Development of the Child and the Race* (1896) and *Social and Ethical Interpretations in Mental Development* (1897).

Baldwin's general principles were very close to Tarde's theory, but whereas the sociologist Tarde went from group processes to the individual, the psychologist Baldwin went from the individual to society. From the standpoint of psychology, he wrote, social organisation coincided with the organisation of the individual and of his self-awareness. The structure of the

personality and of his/her self-awareness, according to him, did not simply 'reflect' the organisation of society but was identical with it.

The sociological aspect of this problem was studied by Prof. Charles Horton Cooley (1864-1929) at the University of Michigan. He called his approach 'organic', not in the sense of biological organicism, but because he started from recognition of the initial unity of the individual and society. 'The organic view,' he wrote, 'stresses both the unity of the whole and the peculiar value of the individual, explaining each by the other.'[28] It was as senseless to analyse the social consciousness of the group and the consciousness of the individual separately as to counterpose the music of the whole orchestra to the sound of the separate instruments. The 'individual' and 'society' were not two different entities but different aspects of the study of the life process of human interaction, which could be examined either from the aspect of the individual and his self-awareness, of the dynamics of the social self, or from the aspect of social institutions and fixed types of intercourse.

Cooley dissociated himself equally from both the 'nominalist' and the 'realist' extremes.

> Is society anything more than the sum of the individuals? In a sense, Yes. There is an organization, a life-process, in any social whole that you cannot see in the individuals separately. To study them one by one and attempt to understand society by putting them together will lead you astray. It is 'individualism' in a bad sense of the word.[29]

Cooley devoted his first book *Human Nature and the Social Order* (1902) to study of the individual, personal aspect of the 'life social process'. In his second book *Social Organization* (1909) he was already examining society from the angle of the social whole. Its sub-title 'A Study of the Larger Mind' indicated that its attention was mainly directed to social consciousness, not reducible to the consciousness of separate individuals. But the principle of the approach was one and the same.

Cooley counterposed his treatment of human nature to instinctivist and mechanistic interpretations. In his view one could not attach the significance of universal motives of social

behaviour to instincts. The diverse facts of social life demonstrated the variability of the motives of man's behaviour, the absence of a single law governing his actions. Human nature was plastic and mobile; it could be compelled to work in practically any direction when its laws were properly understood.

The interpretation of the individual by means of the principle of 'imitation' was just as unsatisfactory. It is no easier for a child to repeat something after an adult, a word, say, than for an adult to learn a musical piece of average difficulty. Furthermore, adults imitate a baby in its first year more than it imitates them.

Cooley considered it a sign of a truly social being, a capacity to distinguish himself from the group, to be aware of his self and his personality. But a *sine qua non* of the development of self-awareness was communication with other people and assimilation of their opinions about himself. 'There is no sense of "I", as in pride or shame, without its correlative sense of you, or he, or they.'[30] Conscious activity, according to him, was always social activity. And to act socially meant to coordinate one's activity with those notions of 'I' that other people had formed. 'As social beings we live with our eyes upon our reflection, but have no assurance of the tranquillity of the waters in which we see it.'[31] Our Self is moulded through a summation of the impressions it seems to us we are making on those around us. According to Cooley's conception of 'the looking-glass self', the human 'I' includes (1) a notion of 'how I seem to another person', (2) a notion of 'how that other values my image', and (3) specific feeling in the nature of pride or humiliation, stemming from that.

Every act of social consciousness was simultaneously, according to Cooley, an act of self-awareness. Society reveals the individual in the form of social aspects of his own personality. But the individual's social consciousness did not coincide with the consciousness of all society. The latter went beyond the bounds of a person's inner world. It was a broader consciousness (larger mind), which Cooley sometimes designated by the term 'public mind' to contrast it with the individual mind. The unity of the 'public mind' consisted in the organisation, interaction and causal connection of its parts, rather than in similar-

ity.[32] The sources of social organisation lay in the 'primary group'.

Cooley called the co-operation and association of individuals directly interacting with one another face to face the primary group. It was a small circle of people who maintained stable close relations distinguished as a rule by intimacy, mutual affection and understanding. The primary group included persons about whom one could say 'We'. Examples of such groups were 'the play-group of children', the family, and the neighbourhood. It was in them that the individual first acquired a feeling of social belonging and assimilated common ideals. He called these groups 'the nursery of human nature'.[33] He was well aware that primary groups were 'not independent of the larger society, but to some extent reflect its spirit';[34] and also that rivalry, competition, and hostility existed in them, as well as harmony. But he stressed that it was the primary groups that constituted the basis of what is universal in human nature and human ideals, and that their 'primariness' lay chiefly in their being 'fundamental in forming the social nature and ideals of the individual'.[35]

Cooley's theory of the 'looking-glass self', which developed in the stream of the old philosophical tradition (the idea that self-awareness was shaped through intercourse and exchange of opinions with other people existed already in Adam Smith), was further developed in the works of G. H. Mead and so-called symbolic interactionism. The concept of the primary group, forgotten in the 1930s, has again become popular in studies of socialisation and the theory of small groups.

Cooley's sociology had the same shortcomings, however, as the other varieties of psychologism.

He combined the emphasis on the subjective-personality aspect of the social process (although he stipulated its conditional character) with a clear ignoring of material, production processes. It was not simply a matter of awkward formulations like 'society... *is a relation among personal ideas*'.[36] His methodology was an *immanent-idealist* one, since the social interaction during which the self-aware individual was moulded, was reduced in practice to a process of inter-personal intercourse which excluded from it material activity, work, and the attitude to the macrosocial system that any primary group was

a part of. The objective system of relations of production and the class structure of society seemed less essential in this conception than the relationship of individuals 'face to face'. Even Mead, who highly appreciated Cooley's theory, noted the illegitimacy of reducing the social interaction of individuals to their exchange of opinions with one another. Cooley's psychological introspectivism, according to Mead, carried with it 'the implication of complete solipsism', since with him 'society really has no existence except in the individual's mind, and the concept of the self as in any sense intrinsically social is a product of imagination'.[37]

Even allowing for its subsequent development in Mead's works, and his followers, the interactionist orientation, fruitful in the context of a socio-psychological study of interpersonal relations, proved inadequate to describe and explain macro-social processes, class relations, and the nature of political power.

7. Psychological Sociology in the Historical Perspective

What were the main results of psychological sociology at the turn of the century?

Its attention was centred on problems of social (group, collective) consciousness, and its nature, structure, and functions. The most important processes and psychological mechanisms of group and interpersonal relationships were discussed in detail, viz., mental contagion, suggestion, imitation, and the social content of the human personality itself. The foundation was laid then of the theoretical, and later empirical study of public opinion and mass communication. Psychosociologists, rejecting the biologisation of society, also tried to overcome the limited character of evolutionism; their theoretical conceptions became increasingly analytical. A very important positive result of that was the rise of social psychology as an independent discipline, although, having emerged at the boundary of sociology and psychology, this new discipline for some time still had no clearly defined subject-matter, being pulled by turns to both of its 'progenitors'.

But study of the processes of group relations, while neces-

sary, by no means exhausted the sphere of the social, and did not justify the reducing of sociology to social psychology that was extremely typical of all the schools concerned. For Tarde social, or inter-mental psychology was a synonym in essence for sociology; he did not draw meaningful differences between them. Le Bon, Baldwin, McDougall, and Cooley by turns called their approach sometimes social psychological and sometimes sociological. The idea of merging of sociology and social psychology was actively propagated by the American sociologist Charles Ellwood (1873-1948). Another influential American sociologist, Edward Alsworth Ross (1866-1951), author of a popular textbook of social psychology, considered it a part of sociology, dividing the latter into social psychology (whose subject-matter was the psychological processes arising in an association of people) and social morphology, i.e., the science of social forms.[38]

Even when attention was concentrated on general social problems and relations (Cooley's theory of social organisation, or Ross's theory of social control), they were interpreted as 'clusters' of interpersonal relations or as specific aspects of them.

The reduction of social relations to 'inter-mental' interaction, and sociology to social psychology was nothing else than a hidden form of philosophical idealism. For Marxian sociologists there is no question whether it is necessary to 'recognise' the significance of mental factors, social orientations, motives, etc.; the problem is how to connect these thoughts and feelings with the law-governed movement of macrosocial processes. The social cannot be reduced to the 'interpersonal', since people are involved in socio-production relations 'not as individuals but as members of a class',[39] and their social functions and their 'distinctive social characters are, therefore, by no means due to individual human nature as such',[40] but to a certain division of the social system.

Notes

[1] John Stuart Mill. *System of Logic. Ratiocinative and Inductive* (Longmans, Green, London, 1889), p 573.

[2] *Ibid.*, p 571.

[3] Lester F. Ward. *The Psychic Factors of Civilization* (Ginn & Co., Boston, Mass., 1906), p 123.

[4] F.H. Giddings. *The Principles of Sociology. An Analysis of the Phenomena of Association and of Social Organization* (MacMillan & Co., London, 1924), p 16.

[5] *Ibid.*, p 420.

[6] Ibid.

[7] *Ibid.*, p 13.

[8] *Ibid.*, p 17.

[9] F. H. Giddings. *Studies in the Theory of Human Society* (The Macmillan & Co., New York, 1926), p. 252.

[10] Nicholas S. Timasheff. *Sociological Theory. Its Nature and Growth* (Doubleday & Co., Garden City, N.Y., 1955), pp 138-140.

[11] Wilfred Trotter. *Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War* (The Macmillan Co., New York, 1947).

[12] Graham Wallas. *Human Nature in Politics* (Constable & Co., London, 1910).

[13] Lister L. Bernard. *Instinct. A Study in Social Psychology* (Holt, New York, 1924).

[14] Wilhelm Wundt. Logik der Geisteswissenschaften. In: *Logik*, Vol. 3, (Verlag von F. Enke, Stuttgart, 1908), p 227.

[15] Gustave Le Bon. *Psychologie des foules* (Alcan, Paris, 1918), p 17.

[16] Stanley Milgram and Hans Toch. Collective Behavior: Crowds and Social Movement. In: Gardner Lindsey and Elliot Aronson (Eds.) *The Handbook of Social Psychology*, Vol. 4 (Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., Reading, Mass.,1969), pp 507-611.

[17] A. Vigouroux, P. Juquelier. *La contagion mentale* (Doin, Paris, 1905).

[18] Gabriel Tarde. *On Communication and Social Influence* (Univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1969), p 73.

[19] *Ibid.*, p 104.

[20] *Ibid.*, p 95.

[21] G. Tarde. *Les lois de l'imitation. Etude sociologique* (Alcan, Paris, 1890), p 97.

[22] G. Tarde. *L'opinion et la foule* (Alcan, Paris, 1910), p 2.

[23] *Ibid.*, p 63.

[24] G. Tarde. *Les lois de l'imitation*, p 415.

[25] N. K. Mikhailovsky. *Geroi i tolpa* (Heroes and the Crowd). *Collected Works*, Vol. 2 (St. Petersburg, 1907), pp 434-435.

[26] Emile Durkheim. *Le suiside. Etude de sociologie* (Alcan, Paris, 1897), pp 114-115.

[27] William James. *The Principles of Psychology*, Vol. 1 (Henry Holt & Co., New York, 1893), pp 291-305.

[28] C. H. Cooley, *Human Nature and the Social Order* (Schocken Books, New York, 1964), p 36.

[29] *Ibid.*, p 48.

[30] *Ibid.*, p 182.

[31] *Ibid.*, p 247.

[32] Lewis A. Coser. *Masters of Sociological Thought* (Harcourt Brace Jowanovich, New York, 1977), p 312.

[33] C. H. Cooley. *Social Organization. A Study of the Larger Mind* (Schocken Books, New York, 1967), p 24.

[34] *Ibid.*, p 27.

[35] *Ibid.*, p 23.

[36] C. H. Cooley. *Human Nature and the Social Order*, p 119.

[37] George H. Mead. *Mind, Self and Society. From the Standpoint of a Social Behaviorist* (Univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1946), p 224.

[38] E. A. Ross. *Social Psychology. An Outline and Source Book* (The Macmillan Co., New York, 1917).

[39] Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. *The German Ideology* (Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1976), p. 88.

[40] Karl Marx. *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* (Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977), p 95.

6

EMPIRICAL SOCIAL STUDIES IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

Marina Kovaleva

Empirical social studies have a longer history than academic sociology. They were being made in England and France in the seventeenth century at least from the time of 'political arithmetic' and 'social physics', and long before the advent of the word 'sociology' itself. They were an important and independent source of conceptions, quantitative methods, and techniques of measurement and statistical description for modern sociology.

The history of empirical studies has been systematically developed only recently, from roughly the 1960s. In spite of the appearance of general works on the history of these studies, and of works on the evolution of their methods and techniques, historians of sociology still have to fill the gap between the paucity of studies of its development as an empirical science and the broad descriptions of the forming of sociological theories.

In the early stages of the shaping of sociology, its theory and empirical social studies developed along parallel lines and were poorly linked with one another. That latter were stimulated by pressing practical needs, and the need to gather information to substantiate social reforms in response to the acute problems of nineteenth-century capitalist society, i.e., the rapid growth of towns and of the urban population during industrialisation, the polarisation of poverty and wealth, pauperisation, the increase in crime, and the general intensification

of class struggle. As social problems became more complex, the bourgeois public was more and more alarmed by the 'poor' as a constant potential threat to the foundations of society. This general interest in social problems and the heightened needs of public administration were not met by the existing system of obtaining social information through church parishes and the government financial inspectorate. In the early nineteenth century official institutions, philanthropic organisations, and private persons (doctors, teachers, employers, natural scientists, independently selecting the object and method of organising their studies, and also parliamentary and mixed commissions including members of the public, were involved in all kinds of censuses, polls, and statistical studies.

Official studies were dictated by the needs of government, and the need for detailed knowledge of various aspects of public affairs. In order to control social changes, bourgeois governments tried to create constantly operating institutions to gather information, for example, to carry out a regular general census. Private studies were associated with the activity of philanthropic organisations or opposition parties. Initially in England, and then in other countries, philanthropic social-study commissions and statistical societies were founded to carry out social investigations so as to inform and mobilise public opinion, and draw the attention of official circles to some negative phenomenon, to discover its causes, and to work out recommendations for 'treating social ills' and improving social institutions. Most of the conclusions from the nineteenth-century empirical studies did not go beyond the bounds of moderately liberal, bourgeois-reformist views.

Because of the uncoordinated, fragmentary, and heterogeneous character of these studies (both by subject and composition), and because of their divorce from sociological theory and the universities, the empirical tradition broke off, or was interrupted, and valuable experience was lost. The logic of the development of sociology as a science required an empirical base for checking theoretical propositions. But the need for empirical data for that purpose remained very weak until sociology had actually been established as a university discipline.[1] University sociologists were traditionally occupied mainly with philosophico-historical subjects and were involved in social

investigations as ordinary citizens, made uneasy by social misfortunes and interested in immediate practical results, and not as professionals.[2] Attempts to unite theoretical sociology and social research in the activity of one scholar were crowned with success later, in the time of Durkheim.

But gradually, all the same, there was a professionalisation of activity in the gathering and analysis of data. The proportion of private persons (amateurs concerning themselves with empirical studies) fell, and the number of professors correspondingly rose. The example of England is indicative; there the proportion of the latter rose from 2 per cent in 1834-54 to 14 per cent in 1855-74, and to 24 per cent in 1875-1900.[3] As specialisation grew, there was a differentiation of the various types of social information in the amorphous mass of concrete studies. Demography and statistics hived off as independent disciplines; the foundations were laid of the future understanding of concrete sociological research as a complex social investigation synthesising the data of contiguous sciences, the results of its authors' personal field observations, and secondary analysis of already existing demographic, economic, and other data.

1. Empirical Social Studies in the United Kingdom

In the United Kingdom the first half of the nineteenth century was a period of reform of outdated social institutions: the system of education, public health, local government, the electoral system, and Parliament. The first Poor Laws were passed. Social studies, which took the form as a rule of statistical investigations and censuses, were a part of this broad reform movement in social legislation and politics. Royal commissions and consultative committees took on the trusteeship of private initiative in these investigations, helping to broaden their scale and at the same time to keep them within the context of the permitted opposition. The conclusions of these commissions led, in separate cases, to changes in the legislation in the fields concerned.

John Sinclair's monumental study (21 volumes) of rural life and the rural population (*The Statistical Account of Scotland*), the results of which were published between 1791 and 1825,

greatly influenced the organisation of population censuses and the content of their questionnaires in many countries in Europe. Sinclair had drawn the Scottish clergy into his work, as was usual at the time, and obtained data on 881 parishes of Scotland. He drew up list of questions containing 116 points, 40 of which were devoted to the geography, mineral resources, and history of the parish, 60 concerned its population (sex, age, occupations and trades, religious affiliation, births, deaths, suicides, murders, number of workless and chronic alcoholics, etc.). The rest of the questions elucidated the state of agriculture and handicrafts.

Subsequent censuses and investigations were no longer linked, in most cases, with the parish as the unit of observation, since it had been disrupted as an administrative unit during the industrial revolution. The main object of analysis became the separate household.

Down to the 1840s many investigations were directed to claryfying the position of the workers and poor strata of the urban population—the problem of so-called social hygiene. The initiators of these studies were often doctors, since they daily came up against undernourishment and insanitary living conditions in this milieu. Among them was one of the founders and active members of the Manchester Statistical Society, James Kay-Shuttleworth. He utilised his position as secretary of the Manchester Board of Health to gather information on the sanitary conditions of the working people. He set up a network of councils in the wards of the city and obtained the necessary data through staff inspectors supplied with questionnaires. The questions concerned the state of housing, the number of tenants, the furniture, the state of clothing, the kind of employment, state of health, etc. From this investigation he published his very significant survey *The Moral and Physical Condition of the Working Classes Employed in the Cotton Manufacture in Manchester* (1832), which became a model for subsequent fuller studies.

The socio-political and intellectual climate in the United Kingdom in the first third of the century led investigators and statesmen to the idea of the necessity of setting up a statistical service. From 1801 regular censuses were taken every ten years. In the 1830s statistical societies were founded in many cities

that united enthusiasts of empirical social studies. Among them was the Manchester Society mentioned above.[4–5] A statistical section of the British Association for the Advancement of Science was formed in 1833 and the London Statistical Society founded in 1834, with the participation of Adolphe Quételet. Their members shared the conviction that the facts discovered by statistics were the sole unambiguous indicators for practical actions. The gathering of facts, a clear orientation on urgent social problems, and direct aid for the government were their unitial aims.

In the London Statistical Society work was organised in four branches of statistics, viz., economic, political, medical, and 'moral and intellectual', the dividing lines between which were very vague. Most attention was paid to economic statistics, but demographic studies, and study of the conditions of the poor, predominated in 'moral' statistics.

Starting from the criteria of the economic and social progress of capitalist society developed in the main by classical political economy, the statisticians of the time employed tables in which, for certain time intervals, economic and social indicators were joined (variables of the market and variables of life expectancy, fluctuations of prices or business activity, on the one hand, and sanitary conditions, professional mobility, income, or education, on the other), which served as indicators of national progress. From analysis of these tables, the connections of life expectancy or other demographic indicators with the social structure of society were elucidated. But in spite of all the new indicators created, and of the improvements in the methods of gathering and classifying the data, which disclosed possibilities for interesting comparisons, the theoretical generalisation of the assembled material was poor.

The need for a clear sociological conception for effective use of empirical social studies is obvious when one compares the liberal-reformist works mentioned above with Frederick Engels' *The Condition of the Working Class in England*, which largely relied on the same information. Engels built up the isolated facts of the liberal statisticians, which did not get across to public opinion precisely because of their fragmentary character, into a balanced picture of the position of the main classes in the socio-economic structure of capitalist society, while the

good intentions of the liberal policy of minor reforms were replaced by a demand for sweeping changes in the main structural elements of society.

At the end of the 1840s there was a decline in England in interest in the study of social problems, due in part to the main aims of the reformers having been achieved; Parliament had passed a number of acts to improve the condition of the working classes, while the latter's political movement marked time for a while after the defeat of Chartism. Later in the 1860s social Darwinism played a negative role in reducing the flow, and lowering the quality of empirical social studies. Whereas researchers had previously linked crime with poverty and lack of education, they now sought evidence to prove inherited degeneracy and biologically conditioned physical and mental defects. The poor strata of the population, criminals, failures, and drop-outs were now regarded as the hereditarily worst part of the human race, and social policy aimed at improving their condition as harmful, since it helped them survive and consequently degrade the racial purity of the nation.[6] In that period empirical statistical studies, among which many were interesting as regards method, switched to anthropology and eugenics (the works of Francis Galton and others).

A turn toward reviving social investigations, in particular of poverty, was noted in the 1880s, and was linked with the name of the Liverpool employer and shipmaster Charles Booth (1840-1916). His orientation on empirical study of the facts, and maximum accuracy in the measurement of poverty was not the result of academic interests and special scientific training but of business practice and a liberal outlook that led him to the 'problem of problems', viz., the existence of chronic poverty in the industrial districts of cities, and of poverty amidst plenty. He accepted only 'scientific facts' and tried to study 'things as they were'. When speaking of 'rational behaviour' the Protestant moralist Booth as a rule had 'economic behaviour' in mind.

In 1885 Booth became a member of the Royal Statistical Society, and started on a study of the data of the Census of 1881 (one of the most active periods in the business life of the United Kingdom) and, later, with the help of workers he hired, he went on to analyse the censuses from 1801 to 1881 by occupation, hoping to discover trends that would make it possible

not only to understand the future, but also to plan it. He succeeded in showing that the structure of the population of the United Kingdom had greatly changed; workers employed in industry had become twice as many as those engaged in agriculture, whereas they had been equal only 30 years before the latest census. This research was a good school for Booth for his future work. He understood the limited, undeveloped character of the census material for the problems that interested him. In addition the research helped him make contact with the official statistical agencies.

During this work Booth had already begun to think about another investigation that would combine broad coverage of the population with a profound qualitative study of the relation between employment and poverty among the working class of London.

The study was based, as with Le Play's school in France, on analysis of family budgets and observance of family life. At first the researchers were only interested in the 'poor'; later the population was divided into eight groups according to the size and regularity of their incomes; from the 'lowest class', which consisted of unskilled day labourers, vagrants, and criminal elements, to the 'upper middle class', which was defined as the class that had servants. In the end Booth obtained a detailed, documented picture of the everyday work and life of the four million population of London, in which the greater part of the material was about the poor (four groups) and comparatively little about the 'upper class' and the 'aristocracy'. Booth's three-volume *Life and Labour of the People in London* was published in 1889-1891. But the work was continued, and much data accumulated and analysed, which went into the third edition that appeared in 1902-03 (in 17 volumes). This edition was divided into three series: 'Poverty', 'Industry', and 'Religious Influences'.[7]

The main sources of data for the 'Poverty' series was the 1881 Census, and information obtained from the police and sanitary and school inspectors. The duties of the school inspectors entailed their regularly visiting the houses they were responsible for; they gathered a wealth of information about families in which there were children of school age. The inspectors began gathering material two or three years before a child reached

school age, and also registered drop-outs. They also recorded the occupation of the heads of the families. Many inspectors worked solely in one area and knew all the people well. Booth later supplemented this information with data of his personal observations of certain streets and houses, since he himself lived for a certain time among workers' families. In addition, the family budgets of members of all groups were analysed from a small sample, except for the 'lowest'. But the number of budgets analysed was too small for reliable generalisations.

Among Booth's other innovatory methods, an interesting one was his idea of compiling coloured social maps of different areas of London so as to show graphically the distribution of all the groups of the population in the city. That is now an ordinary technique of urban studies. His research showed that up to 58 per cent of the persons belonging to the first four groups of the 'poor' lived in certain streets of the central part of the East End, while the average of the poor for the whole of London was 30.7 per cent.

Although Booth decided to limit himself solely to observation of the facts as they were, he could not help asking what were the reasons for poverty and what were the possible measures to improve the condition of the poor. He analysed the reasons under three headings: work, habits, and circumstances.

Hoping to prove his conviction of a link between poverty and working conditions, he turned to an analysis of the occupations and crafts in London. These studies constituted the 'Industry' series. Again the unit was the family, in particular the head of the family. When determining the number of people engaged in an industry, he counted both families and individuals. The main source of information was the 1891 Census, in particular the section on 'tenants', which indicated the number of rooms occupied, and of servants employed, and provided data on the profession or trade of the head of the family. This information was supplemented by the materials of industrial statistics and employers' unions. A vast number of employers, trade union leaders, and other people were interviewed as well.

In that series Booth created a new classification of the population according to revised criteria of people's living conditions, in accordance with which the population was divided into three classes: 'lower', 'middle' and 'upper'. The criteria

were the number of rooms occupied by a family, and the number of servants employed by it. Sub-groups of the 'lower' class lived, respectively, three or more persons to a room (such families proved to be 12 per cent in London), two to three to a room (19 per cent), and one person (23 per cent). In the middle class there were one to four rooms per person, or one servant per four persons (the total of such families in London was around 30 per cent). The rest were upper class.

This classification was not an end in itself, but served as the basis for comparing the living and working conditions of the workers in various industries. The industries themselves were classified according to their primary functions. Booth began the comparison with a description of the objective facts concerning the whole group of industries under study, and also with a general statistical description by sex, age, size of family, and living conditions of those who worked in this group. He then passed on to a more detailed description, indicating the age and sex of those working in various trades, the number of families, and the average size of the families, the birth place of the head of the family (in London or outside), etc. From these data he made a comparison between industries, and then between groups of industries, according to living conditions of the people of different trades (for example, the size of families, overcrowding).

In the last volumes of the series attention was paid to general and theoretical matters, in particular trade and vocational training, trade unions, localisation and distribution of industry, standard of living in the capital. The subject of 'London as a Centre of Trade and Industry' was examined. Booth concluded that universal education should be made the basis for reform in industry, though he also understood that the rise and fall of employment in the country also played an important role in causing poverty. He advocated state aid in the sphere of public health and education, and non-interference in hiring.

The results of all the series of this immense work were summed up in the last volume. The study covered the whole of London. It was divided up into 50 districts according to five different criteria: percentage of poverty, percentage of overcrowding, birth rate, mortality, and percentage of early marriages. He also tried to correlate these criteria. The division of

the population into 'upper', 'middle', and 'lower' classes was also correlated with the 50 areas. A combined index was worked out for comparing the districts, which was obtained by averaging the above-mentioned criteria. In essence Booth was a forerunner of 'urban ecology', which later became a main theme of the Chicago sociological school in the USA.

Booth's work had a great response among the public and promoted the adoption of a number of statutes on minimum wages, pensions, and unemployment benefit at the beginning of the twentieth century. Nevertheless his experience was not sufficiently comprehended by professional sociologists, and did not become an organic part of the empirical base of sociology. As Philip Abrams, the historian of British sociology, noted:

> In the general history of Britain Booth is rightly treated as the more important figure; the scale of his work, its relative originality and its impact on public opinion make any other judgement impossible. But in the history of social science the case is not so clear.[8]

Booth had successors in the twentieth century. Seebohm Rowntree, in his works on urban poverty,[9] improved the method of research, rejecting intermediaries (observers from the middle class), and turning directly to the workers whose condition he was studying. In the classification and evaluation of incomes Rowntree employed an independent criterion of 'efficiency', in addition to the formal criterion of size of income employed by Booth; this criterion was based on the physiological and dietary knowledge then available. Having established that the poverty lay below the minimum level of 'efficiency' that determined capacity to work, he thereby ascertained the significance of a wages level insufficient to maintain that efficiency as the cause of poverty. His analysis made it possible to draw practical conclusions about minimum pay and the system of social insurance.

Arthur Bowley is famous as a master of investigation by sampling; he introduced much that was new into the organisation of such sampling and reduced the labour of carrying out such studies.[10]

Beatrice and Sydney Webb made documented studies of separate social institutions, supplementing Booth's principle

of inductive treatment of empirical data with the principle of the historical development of the social organisation studied.[11]

That generation of British empiricists already had the self-awareness, to some extent, of social scientists. The latter's role began to be distinguished from that of the natural scientist, social worker, or administrator. The direct, instrumental and practical motives and aims of empirical studies were enriched by broader, scientific, cognitive strivings and values.

2. Empirical Social Studies in France

A tradition of statistical social investigations had already become established in France at the beginning of the nineteenth century, associated with the names of outstanding statesmen (Colbert, Vauben, and Turgot) and scientists (D'Alembert, Laplace, Condorcet, and others) of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The Revolution strengthened the practical direction of these studies. France of the end of the eighteenth century was the centre of empirical study of population problems. In 1801 the Ministry of the Interior carried out the first general census so as to elucidate the changes in the numbers, distribution, and living conditions of the population, as well as in agriculture and industry, that had taken place since 1789, the year of the Revolution. During the government of Napoleon two further censuses were carried out (in 1806 and 1810), but their programme was only partially realised. Statistical reports of the different departments and prefectures were often published in the first years of the century, and the unofficial Statistical Society (1803-1806) functioned actively.[12]

The Napoleonic government, however, was not interested in broad publicity for results of studies not amenable to control, and the Statistical Society ceased its work as a result of government pressure. In 1810 the government banned publication of the data of the census, and in 1812 wound up the Statistical Bureau which coordinated official and private studies. From then on the gathering of statistical data became the exclusive right of the government. A full standard census of France was made again only in 1836.

During the Restoration private social studies once more be-

came active, and the publication of official data became more frequent. Social studies broadened their scope. Not only was demographic information about the population published but also data on consumption, incomes, causes of death, and suicides. Attempts were made to classify crimes.

After the Revolution of 1830 the worker question became more acute and problems of accelerated industrialisation became pressing. The government revived certain statistical services and scientific institutions of the pre-Napoleonic period. At this stage the social-hygiene trend in study of the working people's conditions became predominant in France, as in the United Kingdom.

The classic of this trend was Louis Villermé, a former doctor in the Napoleonic army. He published many works on questions of hygiene and mortality among workers, and carried out major investigations of the state of the prisons. His two-volume *Tableau de l'état physique et moral des ouvriers dans les fabriques de coton, de laine et de soie* (Picture of the Physical and Moral State of the Workers in Cotton, Linen, and Silk Mills) appeared in 1840. The data he published concerned the workers' working conditions and life: their numbers, demographic data (births, marriages, number of children in families), average rates of pay of various categories of textile workers, length of the working day, sanitary state of premisses, personal hygiene, diet, family budgets, etc. He also paid much attention to the exploitation of child labour and problems of illegitimate births.

His studies caused a great public stir. The facts on pay and family budgets adduced by him clearly witnessed to the poverty of the workers, while the publicity given to discussion of the facts of child labour in factories gave rise to attacks on him by defenders of the established order. The facts on the exploitation of child labour in France were debated in the British Parliament, which served as an additional stimulus for passage of a law in 1841 regulating child labour.

Another investigator of social hygiene in the first half of the nineteenth century was Parent-Duchatelet. Together with Villermé and other proponents of social reforms, he took part in the movement to found state health institutions and periodicals to discuss matters of social hygiene. A journal *Annales d'hygiène publique et de médicine legale* began to appear in

France in 1829. His two-volume *De la prostitution dans la ville de Paris* (1834), and his *Hygiène publique*, brought Parent-Duchatelet European fame. He utilised police documents, personal observations, interviews, and statistics in his study. He was not only interested in the demographic characteristics of prostitutes, their numbers in the city, and the changes in prostitution in time, but also in features that revealed the life and psychology of this closed demimonde (the social origin and birth place of the prostitutes, their social characteristics, attitude to family, marriage, and religion,) and also the causes that led them into prostitution. The aim of the study was to gather objective information for a more successful fight against this social evil, but he finished it with an admission that prostitution was inevitable, and recommendations on philanthropic, moral and material aid for repentant prostitutes ineffectual.

The work of the lawyer Andre Guerry made a big contribution to criminal statistics, especially his *Essai sur la statistique morale de la France* (1832) and *Statistique morale de l'Angleterre comparée avec celle de la France* (1864). In the *Essai* he established that the number of crimes taking place for a given number of inhabitants was the same from year to year for one and the same areas of France, and that each class of crime had its unchanging distribution by sex, age, and season. For every 100 crimes against the person, for example, 78 were committed by men and 22 by women. The annual deviation from these averages over six years was not more than 1 per cent.

Guerry was unable to explain the regularity in crime statistics. He simply stated the fact and ascribed the regularity to undiscovered causes that gave rise to crime. In opposition to the common opinion that the main cause was lack of education he rejected a direct link between education and crime, meticulously comparing the distribution of education data on the one hand and types of crime on the other for 85 departments of France. He drew attention to a number of attendant characteristics of both series—the levels of departments' industrial development—and considered them a decisive variable both for the standard of education and for crime.

The works of the Franco-Belgian scientist Adolphe Quételet (1796-1874), one of the major statisticians of the nineteenth century, have been of special methodological significance for

the development of empirical social studies right down to our day. While working in many fields of mathematical science (astronomy, meteorology, etc.), he paid much attention to propaganda for statistical methods of studying society. National statistical societies were organised with his help in the United Kingdom and France. Quételet was the initiator of the founding of the International Statistical Association for cooperation in the gathering of social information, and of the convening in Brussels in 1853 of the first International Statistical Congress.

In his first socio-anthropological studies, like *Recherches sur le penchant au crime aux different âges*, Quételet studied the distribution of peoples' physical characteristics and the statistics of crime by probability methods, endeavouring to get as simple as possible a tabular expression of the quantitative information needed for practical purposes. The mortality tables he compiled, for instance, proved useful for insurance societies.

His *Physique sociale ou Essai sur le développement des facultés de l'homme* (English translation *A Treatise on Man and the Development of His Faculties)*, published in 1835, marked the transition from simple statistical description to deliberate use of empirical quantitative data to establish patterns of social life.[13] Quételet understood the task of the statistician quite broadly: statistics was concerned with a state for a certain period, brought together the elements that pertained to its life, and studied how to make them comparable and how to combine them in the most advantageous way so as to identify all the facts they could reveal.[14] His works also marked a transition from intuitive development of separate methods to systematic work to unify the technical procedures, terms, and techniques of statistical analysis.

Quételet's main contribution to the development of social research was his discovery of certain statistical laws of social being.[15] By laws of the social world he understood the stability in time of the average characteristics of people and a given population: mean physical properties, the constant average percentage of suicides and crime in society, constant rate of marriage in various age groups, and so on. In studying graphs of the distribution of these characteristics of a population, he drew attention to the point that they were similar to the classical standard curve of the distribution of observation errors,

well studied by mathematicians. That led him to the thought that, with a sufficiently large number of observations, the distribution of people's various properties would obey the law of standard distribution, and became grounds for the idea of 'average man', i.e., of a certain average or mean (usually arithmetical) from man's characteristics studied by a given statistical aggregate. Man, considered abstractly, as a member of the whole species, and as bearing the average of all the qualities found in others, he called 'average man'. He might be taller or stronger (Quételet said) in one country than in another, just as he might also be more ingenious, better instructed, or endowed, perhaps, with a higher morality.[16]

Quételet thought of the 'average man' as a statistical average of the main physical and moral qualities of a nation, as a type or standard, without individual differences, blurring the general picture. It was meant to serve as the axis of analysis, a reference point of the fluctuations in the series of statistical indices that pictured the stable and dynamic states of a society: the average man was, in a nation, what the centre of gravity was in a body; it was consideration of that which led to appreciation of all the phenomena of equilibrium and movement.[17] Preservation of the average man also meant preservation of the type of society.

Quételet associated the concept of average man, a priori in essence, with a singular interpretation of averages in general. He understood the average as a quantity in the calculation of which everything chance disappeared, all deviations from it were wiped out, and only the constant and regular remained. In the social world, according to him, there operated constant causes (sex, age, occupation, geographical situation, economic and religious institutions, etc.) and chance ones, i.e., those which operated indeterminately in any direction. The latter were mainly the forces of man's feedback or opposite reaction on the social system, which 'disturbed' its stability. But with a large enough number of tests, in the language of the theory of probability, the consequences of these chance causes became calculable, and revealed an inner necessity. The so-called law of chance causes asserted that each of man's characteristics (for example, the simplest—weight) was normally distributed around a certain mean in a studied population, and that the greater the

number of observations, the more exactly the empirical distribution coincided with the theoretical probable distribution. From that point of view the 'average man' was a statistical constant forcing its way through the series of chance circumstances; it was the type or norm from which other people of the nation or any statistical aggregate differed more or less solely through the influence of chance causes.

Quételet regarded statistically average data on the same level as facts of nature. A conviction that the necessity and regularity of causal connections in social life were no less than the regularities of phenomena of nature helped him discover stable trends in series of average quantities and constant correlations between certain characteristics, which he declared to be social laws.

He traditionally sought substantiation of the statistical regularities discovered in immutable human nature (such were his arguments about the inclination to crime). In essence all his conceptions of 'average man' were akin to metaphysical conceptions of universal human nature. But in striving to confirm on the whole the fruitful idea of natural regularities in social processes he was close to the position of mechanistic determinism. It was this universalist orientation that enabled Quételet on the one hand to make bold use of averages in all possible cases and often to obtain interesting results, and on the other hand to employ them without allowing for the heterogeneity of the statistical data and without serious sociological substantiation. The average had sense only as the average of a qualitatively homogeneous group. The distinguishing of such internally connected groups was the business of sociological theory. Quételet's main concept—'average man'—was subsequently rejected by the social sciences as a too obvious simplification that ignored the qualitative heterogeneity of the social world and of such big groups as national communities of people. He himself was not aware that his sociological notions went beyond the specific mathematical model he had developed.

Main practical results were obtained by Quételet in the statistics of the 'physical characteristics' of man, in a field that now belongs to demography and medical statistics. He developed his main techniques of measuring social phenomena (which have retained their value to this day) in that field, viz., analysis of the empirical distribution of certain properties in

a group and calculation of averages, the counting of events of a certain kind in a given period, determination of the mean in a unit of time, and prediction of their number in the following period, the counting of events by age groups, and mean norms for a given group.

The posing of the question of measuring 'moral qualities' proved methodologically important for empirical sociology. The contemporary American specialist on quantitative methods in sociology, Paul Lazarsfeld, said that Quételet's moral statistics was a quantitative study of people's non-physical characteristics. In that sphere direct measurement as in the case of physical properties was inapplicable; Quételet therefore proposed to evaluate people's 'moral qualities' by the results of their activity and to measure the activities themselves (by expenditure of energy, frequency of repetition, and so on). He did not fully realise the whole complexity and volume of this problem, in today's language the problem of the operationalisation of sociological concepts. Decision of that problem would have required, first of all, a radical reconstruction, refinement, and concretisation of the socio-political theories known to him. He indicated the direction for further quests in this area, however, and his classification of cases of measurement practically coincided, in Lazarsfeld's opinion, with the commonest typology of measurable variables in present-day empirical sociology. Quételet's mode of thought became an organic part of it.

Frédéric Le Play (1806-1882), a mining engineer by training, left a considerable mark on the history of empirical social studies in Europe as the head of a whole school, methodologist, theorist, and author of a reform programme. Under the very strong impression of the events of the July Revolution, he decided to observe society's life like a naturalist so as to understand the causes of social revolutions. He took as his main object of observation the family, as the simplest model and a cell of any society. All the features of society, and the seeds of its stability and instability, were inherent, in his conviction, in the family. The simplicity and accessibility of observation of the family, provided reliable data for inductive inferences and did not give ground for abstract speculations. Working as a major organiser and consultant of mining and metallurgy in

various countries, such as Austria, Germany, Hungary, Italy, Russia, Spain, the United Kingdom, and in Scandinavia, Le Play studied the life of various families everywhere in detail. He set himself the task, he wrote of his method, of studying personally, in all the regions of Europe, more than 300 families belonging to the most numerous classes of the population. He devoted at least a week, often a whole month, to compiling a monograph on each of them. He wanted above all to investigate in detail the material, intellectual, and moral life of families belonging to the principal European races.[18] As a result there appeared his *Ouvriers européens* (1855), which extended to six volumes in the edition of 1877-79.

Development of the monographic method of observation and description from an all-round investigation of the family was the best known contribution of Le Play and his school to the methodology of empirical social research. The plan of a family monograph included the following sections: a general description of the locality, the occupations in the area, and the family itself; sources of subsistence; way of life; family history; family budget; and various elements of general social organisation, i.e., the forms of workers' contracts with employers, consideration of the promotion of young workers in the locality, and detailed information about the technical and economic conditions of the industry in which the family worked. The main means of collecting information were personal observation and free interviews.

At the centre of each family monograph was a description of its budget, analysis of which in Le Play's opinion made it possible to obtain exact data on the structure and functions of the family and provided a reliable basis for comparing and typing families. He tried to use items of the budget (personal outlays, expenditure on education, etc.) as indices of workers' previously immeasurable qualities and actions, and even more broadly of the whole social organisation in which they lived. He was primarily interested in the family's spending, habits, or working conditions that promoted or hindered its rise in the social hierarchy. A high proportion of expenditure on food in the budget, for example, allowed him to conclude that the family had few chances of advancement. Too large a spending on alcohol and useless diversions and entertainment meant

disrespect for religion and education. He even tried to draw conclusions about class relations from budget indices. Thus he judged the 'aggressiveness' of French sheet-metal workers and tinsmiths toward higher classes from their high trade union membership dues.

Such sweeping conclusions, one must stress, were based primarily on close observation of the family's life and environment rather than just on budget data. The budget items figured as a symptom and measure of certain social relations about which more general considerations, often not clearly expressed were built up. It seemed to Le Play that he was building an objective social science, similar to mineralogy, without any preconceived theories.[19] The obvious departures from the possibilities of the method, like some of the conclusions I have adduced, were due not so much to its internal shortcomings as to Le Play's conservative ideological convictions. The technique of searching for indicators to measure and predict social relations has itself been broadly developed in contemporary empirical sociology. Le Play's ideas gave an impetus to the development of complex socio-economic indices. His immediate successors had already supplemented the indicators of the cash budget by an analysis of time budgets, etc.

Unlike Quételet, Le Play and his pupils found statistical generalisations useless. They did not start from them, but from a thorough examination of the object, in which in their opinion the whole wealth of social relations was embodied, i.e., from the family as the main force of social control and socialisation.

Le Play's pupils and followers, such as Henri de Tourville and Edmond Demolins, broadened the sphere of application of the monographic method. Following him, they usually singled out the habitat of the family as the initial moment in a universal scheme of analysis of social phenomena known as the 'nomenclature of social science'. On that point Le Play's school supported the doctrine of geographical determinism, claiming that natural conditions determined the type of work, the character of the family, and ultimately society, and the outlook for them. In addition there were more than 20 points in the scheme ranked in order from the simple to the complex. The plan of a family monograph was supplemented by a description of the neighbourhood, the corporation, the parish, the

town, the province, and the state. The wealth of the factors considered in the 'nomenclature' gave Pitirim Sorokin grounds for classifying Le Play's school as a 'synthetic' one in the history of sociology. The school, employing its scheme for decades, carried out numerous studies of the social systems of various nations.

A result of the study of families was a typology of them. But this study was not an end in itself for Le Play or his pupils. Examination of the types of families was a means to understanding the historical movement and functioning of society as a whole, and to forecasting reforms. Le Play distinguished three types of family: patriarchal–the individual was fully subordinated to the community and the family acted as a single, indivisible unit; the stem family[20]–all the family property was passed to a single heir, chosen by the father, the rest of the children migrating (with a chance of returning to the parental foyer in times of misfortune); the unstable–lack of sufficient means to pass on to posterity, and a separate existence of parents and children. For Le Play a highly stable patriarchal family was an indicator of a conservative backward society (a historical analogy with the Orient). The stem family in his view was an indicator of the most acceptable social structure, in which tradition and innovation were balanced. The third type, the unstable family, was characteristic of the French society contemporaneous with him, drawn into the process of industrialisation and urbanisation. Le Play noted with sorrow a trend in the movement of society from the patriarchal type of family to the unstable.

Le Play's political convictions, close to the views of the traditionalists (especially of de Bonald), had already hardened before he began his investigations and remained unchanged. In giving councel concerning the reorganisation of society (Le Play was one of Napoleon III's state counsellors, and a senator), he was more partial to restoration of traditions than to creation of a new social order, claiming that a strengthening of paternal authority was needed first and foremost to stabilise society, which was the task of educational institutions and the national school. That explains the interest of his pupils in the organisation of public education in various countries. Le Play's ideal

in workers' relations with employers was 'patronage', i.e., a patriarchal trusteeship over workers by small employers who were in direct contact with them, shared their needs, and worried about their good. Those views of his subsequently influenced the ideology of fascist corporativism.[21]

3. Empirical Social Research in Germany

The constant lag in Germany, connected with the general backwardness and disunity of the German states in the first half of the nineteenth century, and the delay in the beginning of various social movements compared with the advanced countries of Europe, had a great impact on the development of empirical research in that country. Because of that use was made of the experience and achievements of other countries in the empirical studies carried out there. In contrast to the United Kingdom and France, the initiative for such research in Germany came directly from the powerful bureaucratic authorities, and also from the universities, which explained the involvement in it of such leading social scientists as Gustav von Schmoller, Ferdinand Tönnies, and Max Weber.

As in other countries in the early nineteenth century, German statistics was a mixture of information on geography, history, demography, the economy, and politico-administrative matters. But in the middle of the century these studies began to be differentiated.

An interest in matters of social hygiene and public health developed from the time of the Revolution of 1848. A prominent figure in this field, and one of the founders of medical statistics in Germany, was the eminent pathologist Rudolf Virchow, who proclaimed that 'if medicine is to fulfil her great task, then she must enter political and social life'.[22] The German movement for medical reform was based on the ideas of the French hygienists. Virchow and his associates knew the work of Quételet. The study of the medical condition of Upper Silesia undertaken by Virchow in 1848 went far beyond the framework of a report on the epidemic situation and diseases, and contained an analysis of the causes of the region's economic and cultural backwardness. And his recommendations for

preventing future epidemics constituted a radical programme of social reforms in the spirit of the Revolution of 1848. The modern historian of German sociology, Anthony Oberschall, has pointed out that Virchow's mode of analysis was very close to the approach employed today to describe underdeveloped countries.[23]

Research into 'moral statistics', demography, and the position of the poor section of the population became popular in Germany in the 1860s and 1870s under the influence of Guerry, Quételet, and Le Play.

Ernst Engel, originally a mining engineer, and later a professional statistician, head of the Prussian statistical department, tried to synthesise the approaches of Le Play and Quételet to budget studies. His meeting with Le Play had a decisive influence on the development of his scientific interests. Later he was associated with Quételet and took part in the First International Statistical Congress in 1853. By comparing the data from the budgets of 199 workers' families in Belgium obtained by Quételet's assistants and the data from budgets contained in 36 of Le Play's monographs, Engel found that there was an identical order of expenditure on vitally important needs independent of the type of family and size of income: food, clothing, housing, etc. Furthermore, the lower the level of income and the poorer the family the higher was the proportion of expenditure on food. This is now known as Engel's budget law (1857). He hoped that it, and the anticipated average values of the items of consumption in each income group, would make it possible to characterise families by a numerical index according to their deviation from these averages.[24]

The work of Quételet's epigone Adolph Wagner, became well known in demography, criminology, and physical anthropology, especially in Russia in the 1860s. The title of one of his books was very characteristic *Die Gesetzmässigkeit in den Scheinbar willkürlichen menschlichen Handlungen vom Standpunkte der Statistik*[25] (The Regularity of Apparent Chance Events from the Standpoint of Statistics), was very characteristic. Wagner saw a regularity even where there was a quite wide spread of the data, and where it was risky to speak of the existence of any trend whatever. He studied, in particular, the com-

parative statistics of suicides in Europe, trying to discover their dependence on very diverse factors: weather, religious affiliation, age, profession, and family position, i.e., almost all the causes that Durkheim later analysed in connection with various types of suicide. Unlike Durkheim, however, Wagner had no theory of his own that would let him to put the data in an appropriate order, so that he obtained a rather chaotic picture.

Wilhelm Lexis developed the concept of a mathematical model of mass behaviour,[26] for a long time forgotten but again introduced into sociology in the 1940s. He developed Quételet's idea of the quantification of social phenomena, and his mathematical methods. In that he differed from other German scholars, in whom Quételet's social determinism produced a great impression. Almost all the people working in the field of empirical social studies in Germany in the last quarter of the nineteenth century were associated in some way with the League for Social Policy founded in 1872 by professors, newspaper men, publishers, civil servants, and employers. Among its members were the leading German sociologists, historians, and economists, such as Ferdinand Tönnies, Max Weber, Alfred Weber, Gustav von Schmoller.[27] In the 1880s and 1890s it became the centre organising and carrying out social research in Germany.

Over the period 1881 to 1902 investigations were made into the conditions of farm labour and usury in rural localities, the position of workers employed in trade, transport, and the merchant navy, and the position of artisans and craftsmen. The absence of studies of industrial workers was due to reluctance to aggravate conflict with Bismark's government, which was passing laws in the Reichstag aimed against socialists.

The studies themselves did not much resemble today's. Their programme was discussed as a preliminary, and the main points planned on which it was necessary to obtain imformation. Then these points were formulated as concrete questions. The document thus compiled was sent out throughout the country to the most responsible and knowledgeable people (teachers, landowners, civil servants, pastors and priests, and others), who returned it filled in, far from always exactly following the organisers' instructions. The assembled material

was published, as a rule, without substantial editing. The League was not much concerned with methodological matters. The badly formulated, imprecise questions did not enable exact, comparable answers to be obtained. One of its members, Gottlieb Schnapper-Arndt, who published a monograph *Zur Methodologie sozialer Enqueten* (On the Methodology of Social Inquiries),[28] criticised this practice. But until the appearance of works of Max Weber, who paid close attention to developing the methodology of empirical studies, Schnapper-Arndt was almost the only person who opposed the methodological unsoundness of the League's investigations.

Studies of the labour and life of workers again began to predominate in empirical social investigations in the early twentieth century. Non-Marxist researchers' turn to this theme was due to their desire to find possibilities of managing large-scale industry without coming into conflict with the workers' interests, and so preserving the existing social order. The tasks were substantially broadened in comparison with early such studies. The physiological and psychological factors of factory and farm work, and the socio-political orientation and intellectual requirements of the workers were studied, in addition to the material conditions of production and daily life.

Max Weber defined the tasks of such studies as follows in 1908: it was necessary, on the one hand, to establish what effect *large-scale private industry* had on the personal qualities, vocational fate, and 'lifestyle' of its workers, what physical and mental qualities it developed in them, and how these qualities were expressed in their personal experience; and it was necessary, on the other hand, to understand how far the ethnic, social, cultural origin, traditions, and living conditions of the workers put a limit to large-scale industry's capacity to develop, and on the direction of its development.[29]

Weber's role as a major organiser of empirical social studies as well as a classic of non-Marxist sociological theory began to be recognised only comparatively recently.[30] His first empirical work was *Die Verhältnisse der Landarbeiter in ostelbischen Deutschland* (The Condition of Landworkers in German East of the Elbe) (1892). His research in the field of industrial sociology retains its value to our day. As a representative of the

League for Social Policy he carried out an empirical study in a textile mill in the summer and autumn of 1908, and later published a methodological introduction to it under the title of *Zur Psychophysik der industriellen Arbeit* (On the Psychophysics of Industrial Work) (1908-09).[31] In this study he attempted to establish the dynamics of workers' occupational careers, social origin, and life-style, and also to check several hypotheses about the factors of their productivity. He wanted to clarify how far the laboratory methods of experimental psychophysics were applicable to a study carried out in the real conditions of factory production. He was interested in the relationship of the worker's psychophysical state with labour productivity and the enterprise's development as a whole. Although most of the workers refused to take part in the study, the preparatory stage of the work proved valuable in itself as regards methodology. The main difference between Weber's approach and the present-day one was the absence in his research of the primary object of study of the industrial sociology of our day, viz., the group. That was probably connected with his methodological individualism, and his theory of social action. He relied on the psychophysical characteristics of industrial work in the context of his sociological scheme, employing his typology of social actions.

In assessing the place of empirical studies in Weber's sociology, most contemporary (above all, American) authors come to the conclusion that his activities as an empirical researcher and his interest in the method and technique of research cannot be adequately understood by presenting them as an appendage to his sociology. Weber sought to make sociology an empirical science, and therefore those studies were a necessity rather than a luxury for him.

The broadest study of labour in industry of the early twentieth century was Adolf Levenstein's study published in 1912 under the title *Die Arbeiterfrage* (The Labour Question). During the course of 1907-11 he sent out 8,000 questionnaires to three categories of workers (miners, steelworkers, and textile workers) in eight industrial areas, 1,000 to each. At first he distributed them to his many friends and acquaintances among the workers; later he asked those from whom he received replies to give the questionnaire to others. As a result he got quite a high percent-

age of returned questionnaires (63 per cent). At first he simply published the answers of some of those questioned; then he showed them to professional sociologists, including Weber; the latter asked him to let some of his colleagues take part in the further processing of the data. Levenstein refused help, but listened to the advice to make a quantitative analysis of the answers.

Levenstein's questionnaire was badly worked out methodologically, but it raised a number of important matters related to the life of workers: their motivation, satisfaction, claims, and general attitude to their condition. When analysing the results obtained, he divided his questionnaire into five parts: general data (name, age, job, family position, number of children, income, piece-work or hourly rate of pay); attitude to work (tiredness, preferred form of pay, thoughts during work); hopes and desires connected with work; matters connected with use of free time. Altogether there were 26 open questions in the questionnaire. Consequently there were serious difficulties in their processing. But when the typical replies of all three categories of workers were reckoned up, it proved that interesting new data had been obtained, in spite of the great looseness and mistakes in the questioning method.[32]

At the turn of the century it became obvious that purely empirical generalisation of the data of concrete studies was not sufficient. It was also impossible to put up any longer with the separate existence of 'sociology' and empirical social research, contact between which had been haphazard and rare, as a rule, in the nineteenth century. Booth's empirical classification of families, for instance, consolidated the traditional British division of social classes into 'upper', 'middle', and 'lower' in the theory of stratification.

The gulf between the empiric and theory was largely due to the fact that global historical, evolutionary schemes not amenable in principle to testing at the microlevel of the common type of empirical research, predominated in the sociological theories of the nineteenth century. One must recall that Comte and Spencer, whose doctrines became a synonym for speculative thought for subsequent generations of Western sociologists, had already called for making sociological theories empirical. But by empirical they understood concrete historical studies

that could fill in the abstract schematicism of a sociology which ignored living historical movement. But most of the empirical social studies of that time were devoted to description of the contemporaneous state of society and its acute problems (poverty, crime, the condition of the workers, etc.). In other words, sociological theory was diachronally oriented and empirical research synchronally. In order to bring about the long-desired meeting of theory and the empiric, there had to be a radical change in the character of the former toward greater analyticity and a lowering of its level of generalisation.

Up to the end of the nineteenth century social research was not linked in practice with theoretical sociology. At the end of the century the position began to change, in the work of Durkheim, Weber, and Tönnies. But only in the 1920s was the problem of uniting theoretical and empirical sociology faced up to, and special development of the methodology and technique of empirical social studies begun.

Notes

[1] See Anthony Oberschall (Ed.). *The Establishment of Empirical Sociology. Studies in Continuity, Discontinuity, and Institutionalization* (Harper & Row, New York, 1972), p 6.

[2] *Ibid.*, p 10.

[3] See Stephen Cole. Continuity and Institutionalization in Science: a Case Study of Failure. In: Anthony Oberschall (Ed.). *Op. cit.*, p 110.

[4] Thomas S. Ashton. *Economic and Social Investigations in Manchester. 1833-1933* (King, London, 1934).

[5] David Elesh. The Manchester Statistical Society: a Case Study of Discontinuity in the History of Empirical Social Research. In: Anthony Oberschall (Ed.). *Op. cit.*, pp 31-72.

[6] B. Lecuier, A. Oberschall. Sociology: the Early History of Social Research. *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, Vol. 15 (New York, 1968), pp 43-44.

[7] Charles Booth. *Life and Labour of the People in London*, 17 vols. (Macmillan & Co., London, 1902-03).

[8] Philip Abrams. *The Origins of British Sociology: 1834-1914* (Univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1968), p 138.

[9] B. Seebohm Rowntree. *Poverty. A Study of Town Life* (Macmillan & Co., London, 1902).

[10] A. L. Bowley and A. R. Runett-Hurst. *Livelihood and Poverty. A Study in the Economic Conditions of Working Class Households in Northampton, Warrington, Stanley and Reading* (London, 1915).

[11] Sidney and Beatrice Webb. *The History of Trade Unionism* (Longmans, Green & Co., London, 1907).

[12] B. Lecuier and A. Oberschall. *Art. cit.*, pp 44-45.

[13] Adolphe Quételet. *Physique sociale ou Essai sur le developpement des facultés de l'homme*, 2 Vols. (Muquardt, Brussels, 1869).

[14] *Ibid.*, Vol. 1, pp 101-102.

[15] Adolphe Quételet. *Du système social et des lois qui le regissent* (Guillaumin, Paris, 1848).

[16] See Adolphe Quételet. *Physique sociale*, Vol. 1, p 147.

[17] *Ibid.*, pp 369-370.

[18] F. Le Play. *La réforme sociale en France déduite de l'observation comparée des peuples européens,* Vol. 1 (Dentu, Paris, 1887), p 68.

[19] *Ibid.*, p 70.

[20] The concept of *famille-souche* (stem family), introduced by Le Play, plays an important role in contemporary historical demography and the sociology of the family.

[21] Walter Goldfrank. Reappraising Le Play. In: Anthony Oberschall (Ed.). *Op. cit.*, p 133.

[22] Anthony Oberschall. *Empirical Social Research in Germany. 1848-1914* (Mouton & Co., Paris, 1965), p 39.

[23] *Ibid.*, p 40.

[24] *Ibid.*, p 44.

[25] Adolph Wagner. *Die Gesetzmässigkeit in den Scheinbar willkürlichen menschlichen Handlunger von Standpunkte der Statistik* (Geisler, Hamburg, 1844).

[26] Wilhelm Lexis. *Zur Theorie der Massenerscheinungen* (Freiburg, 1877).

[27] Anthony Oberschall. *Empirical Social Research in Germany*, pp 21-27.

[28] Gottlieb Schnapper-Arndt. *Methodologie sozialer Enqueten* (Frankfurt a. M., 1888).

[29] See Max Weber. Methodologische Einleitung für die Erhebungen

des Vereins für Sozialpolitik über Auslese und Anpassung (Berufswahlen und Berufsschicksal) der Arbeiterschaft der geschlossenen Grossindustrie. In: *idem. Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Soziologie und Sozialpolitik* (Verlag von J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen, 1924), p 1.

[30] Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Anthony Oberschall. Max Weber and Empirical Social Research. In: *American Sociological Review*, 1965, *30*, 2: 185-199.

[31] Max Weber. Zur Psychophysik der industriellen Arbeit. In: *idem. Op. cit.*, pp 61-255.

[32] Adolf Levenstein. *Die Arbeiterfrage* (Rheinhardt, Munich, 1912).

7

THE CRISIS OF EVOLUTIONISM AND THE ANTIPOSITIVIST TRENDS IN SOCIOLOGY AT THE TURN OF THE CENTURY

Igor Kon

1. The Methodological Situation in Social Science at the Turn of the Century

The end of the nineteenth century was characterised as the end of the 'peaceful' period in the development of capitalism, and the onset of a new, imperialist phase in it. The sharpening of the antagonistic contradictions of the capitalist economy, the strengthening of the class struggle, and the replacement of 'free' competition by the dominance of monopoly capital (and later its conversion into state-monopoly capitalism) all caused a serious shift in ideology. The complacent expressions of bourgeois ideologists about their own world as the best of all worlds, typical of the liberalism of the mid-nineteenth century, began to sound ironical.

For all its criticisms of the future society, positivist evolutionism was essentially apologetic. As Karl Marx wrote in the introduction to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy,*

> What is called historical evolution depends in general on the fact that the latest form regards earlier ones as stages in the development of itself and conceives them always in a one-sided manner, since only rarely and under quite special conditions is a society able to adopt a critical attitude towards itself; in this context we

are not of course discussing historical periods which themselves believe that they are periods of decline.[1]

The historical optimism of bourgeois conceptions began to fade little by little after 1848. After 1870 pessimism was intensified; the future was no longer painted by the most far-sighted ideologists of the ruling class in such a rosy light as before. The Swiss historian Jacob Burckhardt, for example, wrote in 1872 that he had a presentiment that might seem quite mad but that he could not throw it off. The military state would become a powerful large-scale manufacturer. These concentrations of people in big workshops could not be left forever to their needs and greed; a fixed, supervised mass of misery in uniform would begin and end daily to the roll of drums—that is what must logically come about.[2] Not a realm of freedom awaited humanity, but the absolute despotism of military authority, outwardly disguised as a republic, and voluntary submission of the masses to leaders and usurpers.

The feeling of global social crisis being experienced by capitalist society was clearly expressed by Nietzsche:

> Falling apart and, consequently, uncertainty are typical of this time: there is nothing that can firmly stand on its feet with a grim self-reliance: men live for tomorrow because the day after tomorrow is uncertain. Everything on our path is slippery and dangerous, and the ice still holding us has become so thin; we all feel the warm and threatening breath of the thaw—where we step, no one will soon be able to step![3]

The collapse of liberal optimism and its principle of *laissez-faire* was combined with disappointment in organicist 'structural' schemes. Sociologists more and more observed capitalism's destruction of the traditional 'communal' structures, i.e., the family, neighbourhood, and the craftsmen's guilds, and in contrast to the spokesmen of earlier liberalism were alarmed by these processes.

The re-evaluation of capitalist society's ideological values was all the more painful since it was interwoven with a theoretical and methodological crisis of evolutionism and naturalism.

The idea of development had been assimilated in a very

simplified form by bourgeois social studies in the nineteenth century. Evolution was understood more often than not as orthogenesis, i.e., movement to a certain initially proposed goal. As social antagonisms were exposed, this orthogenesis—whether in the form of the positivist theory of evolution or the Hegelian historical theodicy (for all their differences they were essentially close to one another on precisely this point)- was subjected to sharper and sharper criticism. Historicism proved in general to be frequently under fire as an idea of the purposefulness of the social process. Positivist evolutionism was justly reproached for its naturalism, mechanism, and underestimation of the 'human' factor.

This anti-evolutionist tendency first showed itself in the philosophy of history, in the works of Arthur Schopenhauer, Jacob Burckhardt, Nicholai Danilevsky, and Friedrich Nietzsche. But anti-evolutionist moods soon penetrated anthropology and ethnography, with which sociology was closely linked in the nineteenth century.

Positivists, starting from the idea of straight evolutionary development, suggested that all peoples passed through one and the same stages, and that culture, political institutions, etc., were always the same in identical natural and social conditions. That was a fruitful approach, to some extent, as it enabled the main lines of development to be distinguished. But it was based on a dangerous one-sidedness—misunderstanding of the diversity of the forms and variants of social development, and a tendency to fit the facts into too simple a scheme. The comparative historical method was thus converted into a means of uncritical collection of facts only to reinforce an apriori scheme. Hence the constant conflicts and endless disputes between sociologists and historians. The sociologists accused the historians of a 'childish passion' for chronology and single facts, exaggeration of the role of 'great men', and incomprehension of the patterns and laws of social development. The historians, for their part, with no less grounds criticised the sociologists for mechanism, a partiality for arbitrary generalisations, strained interpretations, and schematism.

The development of anthropology and ethnography refuted the oversimplified evolutionist schemes and revealed the inadequacy of the comparative method. The ethnographic mate-

rial clearly showed that the link between a society's material life and its culture was by no means unambiguous or unequivocal, that one and the same basis could give rise, according to the concrete conditions, to a diversity of forms of the superstructure, and that it was impossible, when speaking of specific societies, not to allow for facts of the interaction and mutual influence of peoples.

The diffusion of culture had, of course, been recognised earlier. The eminent evolutionist ethnologist Edward Tylor had even written a number of articles on the patterns of the spread of cultural features. But the cultural borrowings were also interpreted in the spirit of evolutionism. The position changed at the turn of the century. Diffusionism gradually became the leading trend in ethnography; its spokesmen Leo Frobenius (1873-1938), Fritz Graebner (1877-1934), Grafton Elliot Smith (1871-1938), and others made processes of the spread of culture the keystone, and not genesis.

The diffusionist orientation in ethnography and study of culture yielded very valuable research results. But, being a natural reaction to the extremes of evolutionism, diffusionism entailed a danger of loss of the main line of development. The thesis that culture mainly spread through borrowing excluded the creation of a generalising genetic theory of culture. The cultural-historical school in ethnography tried to distinguish autonomous 'cultural circles' or 'regions' of sorts. Subsequently, in opposition both to evolutionism and diffusionism, functionalism was advanced as a guiding principle, according to which the explanation of each culture was to be sought in the inner integrity and functional interdependence of the elements of society's culture itself, and not in external influences or stages of evolution.

The eminent American anthropologist, Franz Boas (1858-1942) stressed that it was impossible to study either the evolution or the diffusion of the different elements of culture and art separately, because their significance was determined by their place in the system of culture as a whole. The culture and way of life of any society had to be studied not as a partial case or stage of a single evolutionary process, and not as a product of more or less chance external influences, but as an independent concrete whole that should be understood in its

internal unity. But, whereas the old evolutionism sinned in underestimating the specific value of 'primitive' cultures, treating them only as a stage in the development of European civilisation, now, on the contrary, all cultures and social forms were declared to be historically of equal value, and study of their genesis fruitless.

The methodological reorientation that took place in ethnology was directly related to sociology, too. The boundaries of the two disciplines had never been precisely demarcated, especially as regards the general patterns of culture. In addition there had always been a certain parallelism in the development of their general methods. The diffusionist trend in ethnography was directly intertwined with Tarde's theory of imitation; he wrote, in particular, about the 'diffusion of ideas'; and not without reason was cited by Boas. Durkheim, too, is rightly considered a forerunner of functionalism in English ethnology. The crisis of evolutionism was not a local tendency, but a general one.

The revolution in physics that occurred at the turn of the century, which rocked the old metaphysical ideas not only of the physical world but also of the science itself, and which was analysed by Lenin in his *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, had no less important consequences for the social sciences.

For most of the scientists and philosophers of the nineteenth century Newtonian physics presented an absolutely correct picture of the world, in which the reality was entirely reduced to the arrangement and motion of atoms. Scientists suggested, starting from the Laplacian mechanistic determinism, that if the precise arrangement and motion of material particles at any moment were known, it would be possible to compute the whole preceding and subsequent evolution of the world from the laws of mechanics. That primitive mechanism was blown to smithereens by twentieth-century physics. The revolution begun in physics naturally did not stop there. The advent of non-Euclidean geometry and the theory of sets caused a crisis in mathematics since it became clear that the foundations of this most exact of sciences were not at all self-evident, as had been supposed in the ninetheenth century. There were also serious shifts in chemistry, biology, and other branches of knowledge.

The crisis in physics also shook the sciences of man and history, psychology, and sociology. The naturalism and evolutionism of positivist sociology rested precisely on Newtonian physics, although not all scholars were aware of it; the determinism they defended was a typical Laplacian one. The revolution in physics which indicated the limited nature and inadequacy of these notions struck a heavy blow to mechanism in social studies. Even without rejecting use of the terms of physics, mechanics, and biology when examining social phenomena, sociology was forced to allow for the changes that were occurring in those branches of knowledge.

The revolution in the natural science drew attention to the philosophical premisses of scientific knowledge, and brought out the need to check the basic concepts and methods of science carefully. The positivists of the nineteenth century had naively thought that the development of a 'positive' science in itself resolved all social and philosophical problems. At the turn of the century the main features of the socio-cultural conception had been moulded that later was called 'scientism' by its critics; this conception made an absolute of the role of science in the system of culture and ideology. Positivism, from which the scientistic orientation arose, had not only elevated science to the rank of a universal world outlook, but had claimed that the methods adopted in the natural sciences were applicable to any intellectual problem. That was not only directed against speculative, philosophical 'metaphysics' but also against the habitual methods and style of thinking of the 'traditional' humanitarian disciplines.

This orientation, which reflected the rise in the authority and influence of science, was progressive for a certain time. But at the end of the nineteenth century philosophers were already clearly aware of the growing disparity between scientific and technical progress and the development of spiritual, ethical, and aesthetic values. In addition, the deepening specialisation of scientific knowledge, giving rise to a greater and greater splintering of disciplines, was posing the problem of the integration of knowledge with new force, and of the restoration of an integral picture of the world, and of a kind of metascience (despite the positivist thesis that science was its own philosophy). Finally, and this point is particularly important, interest

in the specifics and correlation of natural and humanitarian sciences had risen sharply at the end of the nineteenth century.

The more rigorous the methods of the exact sciences became the more they contrasted with the traditional ones of the humanitarian sciences. Positivists explained this gap exclusively by the 'immaturity' of humanitarian disciplines, which had not yet reached the level and standard of genuine science. But there was never any quieting of voices that claimed, in opposition to that orientation, that the concepts and methods of the natural sciences could not, by their nature, reflect the complexity of the human world. The crisis of physics promoted a consolidation and enlivening of the antipositivist orientation, which had its ideological roots in the romanticists' idealistic historicism. Whereas naturalism appraised all forms of human knowledge, and life itself, by the criteria of empirical science, the antinaturalist trend in philosophy set itself the aim of criticising science, and of establishing the limits of its effectiveness and applicability, in the light of certain more general, human, life, and ethical values.

This 'critique of science' was very diverse in its aims and content. Some writers employed the crisis of physics to prove the general bankruptcy of the scientific outlook, counterposing a refurbished irrationalism and fideism to it. Others did not question the value and effectiveness of science as such, only opposing scientism, i.e., positivist illusions about science.

2. The Changes in the Philosoply of the Social Sciences. Dilthey and Neo-Kantianism

The philosophical foundations of nineteenth-century sociology were heterogeneous. Apart from positivism, other idealist currents influenced it as well. And positivism itself was far from unequivocal in content. To Comte's holistic-systemic approach was counterposed Mill's individual psychological approach. Taine's naturalist orientation, which claimed that it was necessary to look at human emotions as a naturalist and a physician' would, 'when making classifications and weighing forces',[4] did not prevent him thinking, in regard to historical and cultural

studies, that man was corporeal, 'visible', and important only insofar as his hidden interior was manifested in the outward man.[5]

Nevertheless, sociology was often associated with positivism and naturalism in the public mind of the nineteenth century, and the critique of it was developed under the banner of 'anti-positivism' although, as a rule, as the American historian Stuart Hughes correctly remarked, these critics

> used the word 'positivism' almost interchangeably with a number of other philosophical doctrines that they regarded with equal disfavor—'materialism', 'mechanism', and 'naturalism'.[6]

Justified criticism of vulgar mechanism, naturalism and evolutionism was thus interwoven with idealist reaction aimed directly or indirectly at historical materialism. It was not by chance that 'antinaturalistic' conceptions were also called neo-idealist.

Historians of sociology long ago defined the main lines of this polemic.[7] Positivists and neoidealists were equally hostile to the speculative constructs of the traditional ontological philosophy of history, and stressed the experiential, empirical, concrete character of social knowledge. But they understood its nature and functions differently.

Positivism defended the principle of the unity of all scientific knowledge, endeavouring to extend the methods of investigation of the natural sciences (naturalism) to social phenomena. The antipositivist current, on the contrary, stressed the specific character of social objects and methods of cognition, counterposing the social sciences to the natural sciences. Positivism endeavoured to bring out everywhere the general, repeated, uniform, scorning the specific, individual, and concrete. Neoidealism, following the romantic tradition, centered on the knowledge of the individual, be it the individual person or historical period. Positivism tried to reduce the qualitative diversity of phenomena to a sum total of relatively simple elements or laws. Neoidealism preferred a synthetic generalisation, and a typing of various 'organic wholes' to element analysis.

Positivism tried to present social life as a more or less automatic interaction of impersonal social factor and forces. Its

opponents, on the contrary, looked for a subjective, individual, personal principle everywhere. The objective determination of social phenomena did not interest them so much as the 'inner' drive, i.e., the sense content of an act, the motives and conscious orientation of the actor on certain norms or values.

For positivists the leading social science was 'generalising' sociology, while 'descriptive' history was regarded at best as an auxiliary discipline. For neoidealists on the contrary, history presented most interest; sociology was left in the background, if not declared quite unnecessary.

In opposition to positivist objectivism, neoidealism brought the problem of the knowing subject to the fore in epistemology; namely, what it was, in what lay the guarantee of the general significance of its conclusions; how was cognitive activity related to practical, and so on.

Of all the idealist currents involved in the methodological discussion in the early twentieth century (German and Italian neo-Hegelianism, Henri Bergson's intuitivism, Edmund Husserl's phenomenology, etc.) Dilthey's philosophy of life and neo-Kantianism had the broadest influence on the theory and practice of the social sciences then.

Wilhelm Dilthey (1833-1911), whom historians of philosophy often call 'the Kant of historical knowledge', radically counterposed the humanitarian sciences (which he defined as the sciences of the spirit, *Geisteswissenschaften*), to the natural science.

In Dilthey's view neither positivist naturalism nor the objective idealist philosophy of history reflected the specific nature of social life and the social sciences. In his *Einleitung in die Geisteswissenschaften* (Introduction to the Science of the Spirit) he said that an emancipation of the special sciences began at the end of the Middle Ages, but that those of them which had society and history as their subject-matter remained prisoners of metaphysics (right down to the nineteenth century). In his day, however, they had fallen into a new subjection—to the mounting power of natural science—no less oppressive than the old.[8]

Dilthey did not deny that man was a definite psychophysical entity that could be broken down only in abstraction, and that the natural and social sciences in that sense studied one and the

same human life. But the natural sciences inverstigated in what way the course of events affected man's position, while the humanities were essentially a science of the spirit that studied man's free activity in pursuit of definite aims.

The physical things studied by natural science are known to us only indirectly, as phenomena. The data of the sciences of the spirit, on the contrary, are taken from inner experience, from direct observation of oneself and of other people and the relations between them. Social facts, he argued, were known to us from inside, and could be reproduced inside ourselves, to some extent, from observation of our own states. In understanding them, we revived this reproduction of the historical world with love and hate, and the whole play of our emotions. Nature was dumb for us. Only the power of human imagination shed a sparkle of life and inwardness of it. Nature was alien to man, something external and not internal. Man's world was society.[9]

The primary element of the sciences of the spirit, according to Dilthey, was direct, inner experience (*Erlebnis*), in which man was directly aware and conscious of his existence in the world. The similarity of the mental structures and spiritual world of various people made sympathy, fellow-feeling and affection possible, which in turn was the basis of understanding, i.e., interpreting of other people's inner world, motivation, and the symbols coded in culture. 'We explain nature, but we understand spiritual life', was Dilthey's main thesis.[10]

His theory of understanding was one of the first attemtps at a theoretical comprehension of the problem of deciphering and interpreting the meaning and sense (in contrast to the 'external' structural determination) of socio-historical activity and its objectivation. But, since the direct experience on which any understanding was based was individual, Dilthey considered the existence of a philosophy of history or of sociology that claimed to generalise the course of history as a whole to be both impossible in principle, and illegitimate. 'Any formula in which we express the sense of history is only a reflection of our own resuscitated life feeling... It is impossible to draw any fruitful truth from such formulas, claiming to express the sense of history. This is entirely a metaphysical mist'.[11]

The philosophy of history tried to abstract the general from

the particular and the individual. But that could not be done, Dilthey stressed, without disrupting the living tissue of historical reality. The philosophy of history had therefore preserved traces of its religious origin throughout its development. Even when it discarded old theological forms (Turgot, Herder, Goethe), its content still remained religious and metaphysical.

Dilthey evaluated positivist sociology in the same negative way. He reproached Comte, Mill, and Spencer for terminological indefiniteness, scientific dogmatism, and gross naturalistic metaphysics. Sociology claimed to embrace society as a whole, but in fact whether it was a matter of historical development or the relations of the components of the social structure, only specialised, analytical investigations, broken down by disciplines (psychology, ethnology, studies of cultural systems and social institutions), provided fruitful scientific results. Dilthey's antinaturalism entailed repudiation of sociology as a science.

Dilthey's fervour, apart from a general critique of positivist naturalism, consisted in affirming the subject-orientation, historicity, and structural integrity of social life. The idea of subject-orientation meant that the impersonal social structures and relations that naturalist sociology ranked as independent 'factors', were objectivations, products of people's past and present activity, that could only be understood in relation to that activity. Dilthey distinguished the interpretation of culture and any socio-psychological formations as 'dynamic integrities' from the mechanism and eclecticism of contemporaneous 'psychological theories of society' that reduced the latter to a conglomerate of arbitrarily co-subordinated 'instincts' or 'needs', and culture to a sum total of separate components. The idea of the historicity of social life meant, in contrast to abstract evolutionist schemes, a methodological directive for working out concrete cultural and historical types to express the specific nature of corresponding epochs.

As the founder of the 'critical philosophy of history', Dilthey had a marked impact on the development of historical thinking. Eduard Spranger's structural psychology, Wilhelm Stern's personological conception, and to some extent Gestalt psychology, were a direct development of his ideas in psychology. In sociology his followers were the neo-Kantians of the Baden School, and Georg Simmel, in whose works Dilthey

himself saw a partial realisation of his own programme (although Simmel's philosophy differed on the whole from his); Dilthey's influence was also felt, to a different extent, and in a different intellectual context, in the Verstehen sociology ('intuitive or interpretative understanding') of Max Weber, and in the theories of Charles Horton Cooley, Florian Znaniecki, Pitirim Sorokin, and many others. But it was a contradictory influence.

Because of his initial idealist positions, Dilthey not only did not eliminate the gulf between the 'spiritual' and 'material' principles in the interpretation of social life, but even deepened it.

He clearly saw the weak sides of introspective psychology, was an opponent of relativism, and demonstrated the possibility of objective knowledge of social life. The sciences of the spirit, he said, strove to get objective knowledge of their subject-matter. And man always made objective knowledge of society his aim. Their general, common premiss was the possibility of such knowledge.[12] But while dissociating himself from psychological relativism, Dilthey was helpless in face of historical relativism. According to his doctrine, all creations of the spirit were endlessly transformed: both man himself and his ideas formed quite individual, inimitable ensembles in any given period. But social science, like all things created by the mind, was also part of an ensemble belonging to history.

How then was generally significant social knowledge possible? In trying to root human and social studies in a cultural, historical substance rather than in a spiritual, individual one, Dilthey was unable to overcome the difficulty connected with the contradiction between his method and the task he posed. The subjective method of penetrating the 'spiritual integrity' of social or cultural phenomena could not guarantee scientific objectivity of the results of the research.

There was no place in Dilthey's philosophy for objective truth. Any system of social knowledge corresponded to a certain world outlook. But 'any real world outlook (*Weltanschauung*) is an intuition that arises from the inner being of life',[13] and the main types of the philosophical outlook, according to him, were 'self-sufficing, undemonstrable, and indestructible'.[14]

Even sociologists who were receptive to the antinaturalist

manner of Dilthey's philosophy, like Max Weber, had to dissociate themselves from it. The subsequent treatment of Verstehen (understanding) in the social sciences departed more and more from its intuitive psychological sources, becoming associated with the problem of interpreting the living sense of socio-cultural symbols. 'The difficulty with *Verstehen*,' says one sociological dictionary, 'is that no one can give a precise recipe for it.'[15]

Neo-Kantians like Dilthey opposed naturalism and materialism, stressed the subjective side of cognition, and considered history a more important and characteristic discipline for the whole set of social sciences than sociology. But they brought to the fore logical, methodological problems, the question of the logical status of historical concepts and methods of shaping them, in contrast to those of the natural sciences.

The basic theses of the neo-Kantian conception of science had already been formulated by Wilhelm Windelband in the introduction to his *Geschichte der Philosophie* (A History of Philosophy) (1889), and particularly in his speech *Geschichte und Naturwissenschaft* (History and Science) (1894). Considering the main task of philosophy to be investigation of the cognitive methods of the special sciences, he came out against the tendency, characteristic of Dilthey, to dissolve philosophy in history, and against the 'universalist tendency' of positivism, which ignored the specific nature of the different fields of knowledge. The traditional division of the experimental sciences according to their subject-matter into natural and humanitarian sciences was not successful, in his opinion, because the opposing of the objects did not coincide with the same opposing of the means of investigation. It was much more exact to classify sciences by their method, and by the formal character of their cognitive aims. The experimental sciences, he argued, sought, in knowledge of the real world, either the general, in the form of a law of nature, or the individual, in its historically conditioned form; on the one hand, they traced the immutable form of real events and on the other hand, pursued a single, in itself definite, content. Some were sciences about laws, others sciences about events; the former taught what always happened, the latter what once was.[16] In the first case we had nomothetic thinking, and in the other idiographic.

In practice it involved opposing the natural and historical sciences. While the natural sciences signified the triumph of thought over perception, general concepts had a subordinate place, on the contrary, in history. The attempts of positivist sociologists to 'make a natural science out of history' yielded only a few trivial generalities that were acceptable only after careful analysis of their many exceptions.[17]

The problem posed by Windelband was developed further by Heinrich Rickert (1863-1936) in his *Die Grenzen der naturwissenschaftlichen Begriffsbildung* (The Limits of the Natural-Scientific Formation of Concepts) (1902).

Rickert, understanding the relativity of the logical counterposing of history to science, stressed that his 'historical logic' did not set itself the aim of classifying the sciences and did not claim science to deal only with the general, and history only with the particular and individual.[18] Any scientific thinking, he argued, had to be thinking in general concepts in the sense that the elements of judgments and concepts were general; therefore, if one set history the task of yielding nothing but individual topics and substance, the idea of a historical science would in fact be a *contraidictio in objecto*.[19]

The difference between history and natural science, according to him, was primarily that general concepts were the aim of knowledge for that latter, while they were only a necessary means in history for knowing the individual. The criterion for the essential in natural science was the recurrent, the general, while in history, on the contrary, it was the nonrecurrent, the individual. Therefore the natural-scientific concept brought out what was common in a host of individual formations, leaving aside what characterised them as regards individuality; a historical concept, on the contrary, brought out how these individualities differed from one another.

Since the method and subject-matter of a science were not rigidly linked, the individualising method could be employed in principle to nature (geology as the history of the Earth), and the generalising method to social phenomena (psychology, sociology). Rickert demonstrated a clear preference, however, for 'individualising' history over 'generalising' sociology. While recognising the logical legitimacy of a natural-science treatment

of social reality (though it did not, in his opinion, yield significant results), he then and there added that sociology not only did not take the place of history (with which one must agree), but also told us nothing in general about concrete reality, because the natural-science treatment of historical reality forcibly linked together in a moribund commonness that which had vitality only when separate.

The peculiarity of historical knowledge was that it did not average phenomena but brought out the essential in them by relating them to certain generally significant cultural values. Value, according to Rickert, was the sense that lay 'above' or 'before' all being.[20] Value-relevance was therefore something quite different from subjective evaluation. In drawing this dividing line Rickert thought he could thus ensure the objectivity of socio-historical knowledge. Science, he wrote, was something more than an arbitrary arrangement of arbitrarily dug-up facts that had significance only for whoever was entangled in the values of a certain historical cultural circle.[21] If historical development itself did not contain the criteria for its splitting up, and all historical concepts were formed in relation to certain values, the claim to unconditional general significance for historical concepts presupposed recognition of unconditionally general values. Study of the logic of history thus grew into a metaphysics of values.

The works of the philosophers of the Baden school were essentially a first attempt to investigate the logical basis of the social sciences (only Mill, among the positivists, had concerned himself with that, albeit rather superficially). They brought out the essential difficulties of applying the historical method in sociology, and to an even greater extent theoretising in historical research. The disputes caused by Rickert's book encouraged more active study of these matters. In particular they stimulated the working out of the problem of values both sociologically (values as a standard component of social activity) and epistemologically ('relation to value' and the criteria for scientific objectivity). Rickert's theory of historical concepts formed in respect of a certain value, in contrast to statistical generalisations, influenced the development of typological procedures in sociology. On the philosophical plane the Baden school, together with Dilthey and Husserl, laid the foundations

of the future 'humanist' or phenomenological orientation of sociology.

But the influence of neo-Kantianism on sociology was predominantly indirect (through Max Weber and German culturological conceptions).

The neo-Kantians claimed, quite without grounds, to 'overcome' the dialectical-materialist theory of reflection. As Rickert wrote, if science were given the task of exactly reproducing reality only the weakness of the concept would be discovered, since the sole consistent conclusion of a doctrine about science in which the theory of reflection predominated would be absolute scepticism.[22] But the Marxian theory of reflection does not require the concept to coincide directly with the object and, moreover, reflect it in all its diversity. Infinite reality is embraced only by the infinite historical process of cognition and knowing. Rickert, on the contrary, having metaphysically isolated the separate concept, compared its scanty, abstract content with the boundless diversity of reality, and concluded that cognition did not reflect objective reality. That gave his theory features of a fundamental agnosticism, for which Marxists, in particular Georgi Plekhanov, criticised him back at the beginning of this century.[23] The neo-Kantians essentially consolidated this rift between history and sociology, which had arisen already, in practice, in the middle of the nineteenth century, and the negative consequences of which are still felt (at one pole, descriptive history, which scorns conceptual definiteness and many general scientific methods of research, and at the other sociology, relying on formal definitions that do not correspond to any definite socio-historical reality).

3. The Position of Sociology

How were all these philosophical, methodological problems reflected in sociology itself? Its position in the system of social science at the turn of the century was rather ambiguous. On the one hand it was rapidly developing; the themes of empirical social studies were being broadened, and special journals, societies, and university chairs were making their appearance.

On the other hand, spokesmen of the traditional social sciences continued to look askance at sociology, while confusion reigned in sociological theory itself.

In Great Britain the London Sociological Society, founded in 1903 as a centre of sociology (its first president was the well-known lawyer James Bryce), began to publish *The Sociological Review* in 1908. But the Society had no definite programme of any sort. The first editor of *The Sociological Review*, Leonard Hobhouse (1864-1929), wrote in a leading article that

> not only are there still many who deny the bare existence of Sociology, but, what is more serious, among Sociologists there are still many deep divergences of view as to the nature and province of the enquiries which they professedly pursue in common.[24]

In 1907 the first chair of sociology in the United Kingdom was founded in the University of London, funded by a private benefactor who wanted 'to aid in establishing the academic status of Sociology in the Universities'.[25] Hobhouse was the first holder of the chair. In Oxford and Cambridge, however, the road of sociology was closed, and British sociology had still, for a long time, to develop within anthropology and ethnography.

In France Le Play's followers used the term 'sociology' only for the works of pupils of Comte and called their own studies 'social science'. The institutionalisation of sociology as a university discipline began there at the very end of the nineteenth century under the influence of Durkheim, who, in 1896, became the first professor of 'social science' in France, in Bordeaux University. After moving to Paris, Durkheim read a course in pedagogy, religion, morals, and the family ('the science of education').

The state of affairs was even worse in Germany. The philosophy faculties, in which all the human and social studies were concentrated, did not want to have anything to do with empirical research. As Anthony Oberschall has put it, 'empirical social research was thus important to the German professor in his capacity as a citizen but not in his disciplinary role'.[26] The philosophers' 'traditional' professional hostility to sociology was deepened by theoretical and ideological divergences,

since sociology was associated among conservative scholars with positivism, the socialist trend, and foreign influences. This hostility spread even to theoretical sociology. In a letter to Ward, Gumplowicz complained bitterly that German professors did not want to know anything about sociology, and that the library of Graz University did not even subscribe to the *American Journal of Sociology*. Ferdinand Tönnies wrote in 1912 that 'everyone knows ... that sociology is not accepted at German universities, even as a side table of philosophy'.[27] It also had no support from the bureaucracy. Therefore, in spite of the founding of the German Sociological Society in 1909, headed by Tönnies, the institutionalisation of sociology was still a long way off.

The situation in the USA was quite different. The absence of a rigid system of higher education, the existence of funds, rivalry between the universities, the influence of pragmatism and Spencerism, and a broad movement for social reforms provided opportunities there that did not exist in other countries. The first course bearing the name of sociology had already been read by Sumner at Yale University in 1876. In 1893 Small opened the first chair and sociological specialisation in Chicago.

By 1901, 169 American universities and colleges were already offering their students courses in sociology. In 1905, under the presidency of Ward, the American Sociological Society arose. The *American Journal of Sociology*, founded ten years earlier, became its official organ. But it is not by chance that Oberschall calls the early American sociology 'more a "movement" than an intellectual discipline'.[28]

The founding fathers of American sociology were not professional researchers. More often than not they were clergymen (Sumner, Small, Vincent) and journalists (Giddings and Park). Some were scholars in other specialities (Ward, for example, was a palaeobotanist). As Small wrote in 1924, most of the works published in the USA as 'sociological' were simply 'old fashioned opinionativeness under a new-fangled name'.[29]

When Ward was writing his *Dynamic Sociology* he had no idea that anyone else was working in this field. Small recalled that, when Sumner was elected president of the American Sociological Society in 1907, 'he was not within my field of vision as even nominally a sociologist... He remained the

American echo of laissez faire as represented in England by Spencer'.[30] Sumner, in turn, in the words of one of his pupils, did not use the term 'sociology' because 'he detested with fury most of the work done under that name, most of its tendencies, and nearly all who taught it'.[31] Right up to his death he considered himself a professor of 'political and social science'.

As a result a paradoxical situation took shape. Sociology was developing. Along with national centres, international ones also appeared. The first congress of the International Institute of Sociology was held in Paris in 1894 under the chairmanship of René Worms, which formalised the foundation of this institution, whose members included Schäffle, Fouillée, Lilienfeld, Kovalevsky, Giddings, Schmoller, Gumplowicz, Tarde, Tönnies, Simmel, Wundt, and Small. The *Révue internationale de sociologie*, founded the year before, became the printed organ of the Institute. Another international centre of attraction was the journal *L'Année sociologique* founded by Durkheim in 1896.

Although sociological journals and societies promoted professionalisation of sociology, and strengthened international exchange of ideas, the framework of this exchange remained quite limited. Only 20 per cent of the 258 American sociologists polled by Bernard in 1927 mentioned even one non-American scholar among authors who had essentially influenced their intellectual outlook.[32] Exchange of information was more intensive in Europe, but even there, unacceptable ideas were glossed over by the common form of polemic against them.

Doubt in the subject-matter and methods of their science was not confined to sociologists alone in the early twentieth century, but the position of sociology was particularly shaky. The eminent mathematician Henri Poincaré aptly said that sociology was a science that produced a new methodology every year but never produced any results.[33]

All that could not help affecting the views of the generation of sociologists whose major representatives were Simmel (1858-1918), Tönnies (1855-1936), Durkheim (1858-1917), Weber (1864-1920), and Pareto (1848-1923).

What did they have in common?

Ideologically, a sense of the deep crisis of capitalist society, and a feeling of disappointment with it were inherent in all of them.[34] Tönnies' ideas of the break-up of communal ties, Sim-

mel's of the crisis of culture, Durkheim's of anomy, Weber's of charisma and bureaucracy, Pareto's of the irrational foundations of social behaviour were permeated with burning alarm about social problems they could see no means of solving.

A typical orientation of science and a striving for objectivity were methodologically typical of them (Durkheim's methodological objectivism, which called for examination of social facts 'as things'; Weber's demand for science to be separated from values; Pareto's 'logico-experimental method'). At the same time many of them understood that a simple copying of the methods of the natural sciences was not sufficient to make sociology an independent branch of knowledge.

Almost all the sociologists of that generation stressed the need for sociology's definite emancipation from philosophy, and its experimental, empirical character. At the same time, important philosophical problems were at the focus of their attention, ones like the nature of social reality, the relation of the individual and society, the specific epistemological nature of socio-historical knowledge, the criteria of the truth of social theories, the relation of science and world outlook, etc. In defining the special character of sociology as a science, methodological differences were given no less importance, and sometimes more, than the differences of subject-matter (a direct influence of neo-Kantianism).

In perceiving the crisis of capitalist society primarily as one of its system of values, sociologists paid most attention to study of normative ideas, ideology, culture, and, especially, religion (the sociology of religion of Durkheim and Weber, Pareto's theory of ideology, Durkheim's concept of collective notions, etc.).

The historical, evolutionary approach to phenomena yielded place to a structural, analytical one, and its authors tried not only to illustrate and supplement their general theoretical constructs but also to check them by empirical studies (Durkheim's *Suicide*, and his school's comparative ethnological studies, Weber's works on the comparative sociology of religion, Tönnies' empirical studies, etc.).

And, finally, the confrontation of bourgeois sociology with Marxism became broader and sharper.

[1] Karl Marx. *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* (Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977), p 211.

[2] Jacob Burckhardt. *Briefe* (Dieterich'schen Verlagsbuchhandlung, Leipzig, 1929), p 364.

[3] Friedrich Nietzsche. *Der Wille zur Macht* (Alfred Kröner Verlag, Stuttgart, 1959), p 50.

[4] H. Taine. *Histoire de la littérature Anglaise*, Vol. I (Hachette & Cie., Paris, 1873), p XLVI.

[5] *Ibid.*, p X.

[6] H. Stuart Hughes. *Consciousness and Society. The Reorientation of European Social Thought. 1890-1930* (Macgibbon & Kee, London, 1959), pp 37-38.

[7] Talcott Parsons. *The Structure of Social Action* (The Free Press, Glencoe, Ill., 1949).

[8] See Wilhelm Dilthey. Einleitung in die Geisteswissenschaften. In: *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. 1 (third edition) (Verlag von Teubner, Leipzig, 1957), p XV.

[9] *Ibid.*, p 36.

[10] Wilhelm Dilthey. Ideen über eine beschreibende und zergliedernde Psychologie. In: *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. 5 (Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, Stuttgart, 1957), p 144.

[11] Wilhelm Dilthey. Einleitung in die Geisteswissenschaften, *Op. cit.*, Vol. 1, pp 97, 112.

[12] Wilhelm Dilthey. Der aufbau der geschichtlichen Welt in den Geisteswissenschaften. In: *Gesammelte Schriften*, Vol. 7 (Teubner Verlagsgesellschaft, Stuttgart, 1958), pp 313, 314.

[13] Cited by I. S. Kon. *Die Geschichtsphilosophie des 20 Jahrhunderts. Kritischer Abriss*, Vol. 1 (Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, 1964), p 96.

[14] *Ibid.*

[15] T. F. Hoult. *Dictionary of Modern Sociology* (Littlefield, Adams & Co., Totowa, N.J., 1969), p 346.

[16] See Wilhelm Windelband. *Präludien*, Vol. 2 (Verlag von J.C.B. Mohr, Tübingen, 1924), p 145.

[17] *Ibid.*, p 155.

[18] See: Heinrich Rickert. *Die Grenzen der naturwissenschaftlichen Begriffsbildung. Eine logische Einleitung in die historischen Wissenschaften* (Verlag von J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen, 1929), p XV.

[19] *Ibid.*, p 305.

[20] See: Heinrich Rickert. *Zwei Wege der Erkenntnistheorie. Transscendentalpsychologie une Transscendentallogik* (C. A. Kaemmerer & Co., Halle, 1909), p 37.

[21] See Heinrich Rickert. *Kulturwissenschaft und Naturwissenschaft* (Verlag von J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen, 1926), p 140.

[22] *Ibid.*, p 32.

[23] G.V. Plekhanov. On Mr. H. Rickert's Book In: *Selected Philosophical Works*, Vol. 3 (Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1976), pp 481-86.

[24] Philip Abrams. *The Origins of British Sociology: 1834-1914* (Univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1968), p 147.

[25] *Ibid.*, p 130.

[26] Anthony Oberschall (Ed.). *The Establishment of Empirical Sociology. Studies in Continuity. Discontinuity, and Institutionalization* (Harper & Row, New York, 1972), pp 10-11.

[27] Ferdinand Tönnies. *On Sociology: Pure, Applied, and Empirical. Selected Writings* (Univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1971), pp 24-25.

[28] Anthony Oberschall (Ed.). *Op. cit.*, p 189.

[29] *Ibid.*, p 219.

[30] *Ibid.*,, p 222.

[31] *Ibid.*

[32] Levine, Donald N. Carter, Ellwood B. Gorman, Eleonor Miller. Simmel's Influence on American Sociology. In: *American Journal of Sociology*, 1976, *81*, 4: 813.

[33] Edward Shils. The Calling of Sociology. In: *Theories of Society. Foundations of Modern Sociological Theory*, Vol. 2 (The Free Press of Glencoe, New York, 1961), p 1407.

[34] Reinhard Bendix and Guenther Roth. *Scholarship and Partisanship: Essays on Max Weber* (Univ. of California Press, Berkeley, Cal., 1970).

8

FERDINAND TÖNNIES' SOCIOLOGICAL CONCEPTION

Leonid Ionin

Tönnies was born in 1855 in the town of Oldenvorg in the Duchy of Schleswig in a well-off peasant family. In 1872 he matriculated in the University of Strasbourg and completed his university education in Tübingen in 1875 with a dissertation on classical philology.

Subsequently his interests embraced a broad field of problems of the most varied social and scientific disciplines. In the 1880s and 1890s they were devoted to study of the social philosophy of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries. Their result was a book on Hobbes published in 1896, and subsequently reprinted several times, and a number of papers on Leibnitz, Spinoza, Nietzsche, Spencer, Marx, and others. These studies were continued even later. His book *Marx. Leben und Lehre* (Marx. Life and Work) was published in 1921.

His study of Hobbes encouraged Tönnies to devote himself wholly to the philosophy of history and the philosophy of law. His own conception was formulated in *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft* (Community and Association), written in 1881, with the sub-title 'A Theorem of the Philosophy of Culture', and republished many times later in revised and extended form. This work constituted the basis of Tönnies' sociological conception.

In the early 1880s, Tönnies also showed an interest in social statistics, in particular in the problems of crime, poverty, suicide, etc. In addition to his empirical work, he was also regularly engaged in theoretical work in the field of sociology: *Die Sitte* (Morals) (1909), *Kritik der öffentlichen Meinung* (Critique of

Public Opinion) (1922), *Das Eigentum* (Property) (1926), and *Einführung in die Soziologie* (Introduction to Sociology) (1935).

In spite of his broad theoretical, empirical, and publicistic activity, Tönnies was recognised in academic circles quite late. Only in 1913 did he become a professor at the University of Kiel. In 1910, he made the introductory speech at the meeting in Frankfort that founded the German Sociological Society. In 1921 he was elected president of the Society, and held that post until the Nazis dissolved it in 1933.

Being disposed toward Social-Democratic politics Tönnies supported the Weimar Republic. He opposed National Socialism, warning the public of the danger of a 'decline into barbarism' and was attacked by Nazi demagogues.

He died in Kiel in 1936.

Tönnies' posing of the main problem of sociology followed from his study of the main contradiction in the development of socio-philosophical thought in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries: viz., the contradiction of the rationalist and historical approaches to the origin and existence of the state, law, and social institutions.

Recognition of man's natural rights was characteristic of the proponents of the rationalist mode of thinking, who based themselves on the ideas of the Enlightenment, and consequently, also, recognition of the people's absolute power and inalienable right to make rational laws and a rational social system corresponding to human nature.

Supporters of the historical approach, which is most clearly expressed in the works of the historical school of philosophy and national economy, for example, stressed the importance of the traditional standards and principles of human intercourse and, correspondingly, the need for the existence of historically established forms of state and legal regulation of social life.

Tönnies set himself the aim of linking together the rationalist and historical outlooks, and of combining the advantages of the rationalist scientific method with historical view of the social world. His sources were the works of Friedrich von Savigny, the founder of the historical school of jurispudence (primarily the ideas formulated by Savigny in his little, but very famous book *Vom Beruf unserer Zeit für Gesetzgebung und Rechtswissenschaft* (On the Vocation of Our Times for Legisla-

tion and Jurisprudence), Henry Maine's *Ancient Law* (in which Savigny's ideas were reflected and in which—in the opposition of statutes and contract—Tönnies found the conceptual basis of developing pairs of antinomic concepts ultimately defining the whole content of his own sociological conception), and the works of Lewis Morgan, Johann Jacob Bachofen, and other ethnographers, historians, and jurists of the time.

The historical school of the national economy predominated in the economic thought of Germany in the nineteenth century. A dispute between Schmoller's historical school and Karl Menger, the mathematician, philosopher, and economist, which developed at the end of the century, led to a weakening of the influence of historism in favour of the deductive methods stressed by Menger, and consequently in favour of rational, conceptual thinking in general. Tönnies discovered the basis of the rational approach to social life in the heritage of seventeenth-century European philosophy, above all in the rationalist philosophy of Hobbes and Spinoza.

In one of his first historical philosophical works, on Hobbes, Tönnies formulated the theoretical content of the concepts that subsequently underlay his sociological theory. The most important paragraph in that work (the concluding one), from the angle of the development of his ideas, read more or less as follows: some of Hobbes' successors sought support in him for the conception of the absolute sovereignty of the *communal* will. In the historical context of the time that corresponded to the phenomenon of unlimited monarchy. Others, starting from optimistic notions of the nature of man, rejected even this new authority which overshadowed everything else; they did not consider the *community* per se to be necessary at all, suggesting that the greatest possible happiness of mankind could be attained through a pure *society* and a *social* state, i.e., through individuals' equitable bilateral, binding, and terminable relations with one another. The first successful representative of the first idea was Locke, who was victorious principally through his excursion into the young science of political economy. Its real counterpart lay in the external form of liberal constitutionalism.[1]

Tönnies consistently developed this fundamental counterposing of the two types of society in a small work *Gemeinschaft*

und Gesellschaft with the subtitle 'The Theorem of the Philosophy of Culture', written like the article cited above, in 1881, a work that subsequently brought him world fame. Its basic idea was a counterposing of the concepts of community, or common, joint (*gemeinschaftliche*) relations and connections, and of social (*gesellschaftliche*) relations. The first kind were rooted in emotions, attachments, and mental inclinations, and preserved their own self-identification both consciously, by virtue of tradition, and unconsciously because of emotional ties and through the unifying influence of a common language. Tönnies said he distinguished three types of communal relations: (1) those of descent (which were primarily taken as natural or blood-relationships); (2) 'neighbourhood' relations which were characterised by living together, and were inherent in marital and family relations (in the narrow sense); but the concept had a broader sense; (3) 'friendship' relations, which were based on the awareness of spiritual nearness and kinship, since that awareness postulated or rested on some kind of togetherness (it acquired special social significance when it was realised as a common religious affiliation, or as a community).[2]

The relations of the second kind had a different character. The principle and basis of social relations was *rational exchange,* a change in the ownership of things, so that they had a material nature and were characterised, by virtue of the very nature of exchange, by the parties' oppositely directed aspirations and strivings. These relations were based in part on the communal type described above, but could also exist between individuals who were separate and unknown to one another, even between enemies, because of the conscious decision of the parties involved in them. Various kinds of groups, collectives, and even communities and states, considered formally as 'persons', could enter into this type of relation as individuals. The character of all such relations and connections, Tönnies argued, consisted in the awareness of the utility and value one person had, might have, or could have for another, and which the latter found, perceived, and was aware of. Such social relations, consequently, had a rational structure.[3]

These two types of relations and connections—communal and social—not only characterised people's relations with one another but also described a person's relation to society. In a

community the social whole logically preceded the parts; in a society, on the contrary, the social whole was formed of an aggregate of parts. The difference between community and association or society was the difference between the organic and mechanical ties of the parts that constituted the social whole.

Two types of will, described by Tönnies as *Weşenwille* and *Kürwille* (originally as *Willkür,* discretion), were the foundation of the two types of the organisation of social life. *Wesenwille* was the will of the essence, i.e., the will of the whole, in a certain sense, that determined any, however insignificant, aspect of social life. *Kürwille* signified another type of the action of the integrating factor, a weakening of the social will, and its division into a host of partial, sovereign wills mechanically combined in the whole of social life.

The paramount importance that Tönnies attached to the concept of will was grounds for most investigators to assign his idea to the psychological trend in sociology. But that is not justified. Tönnies hardly understood will as a purely psychological factor. Although he consistently wrote that there was no human conduct without will, it was a very abstract concept in his understanding that lacked any direct psychological sense.

'Since all mental action involves thinking,' he wrote, 'I distinguish between the will, which includes the thinking, and the thinking which embraces the will.'[4] Elsewhere he expressed it even more definitely, saying that will was determined in its human quality by the strength of human thought.[5] The Latin epigraph from Spinoza that he put at the head of a section of his main work—*Voluntas atque intellectus unum et idem sunt* (will and intellect are one and the same)— helps us explain the origin, and consequently the rational kernel, of his notion of human will.

The rationalist character of Tönnies' substantiation of sociology came out in his treatment of the social behaviour of individuals. When analysing social behaviour he employed the typology introduced by Max Weber, by which the following types of rational behaviour were distinguished: goal-oriented, value-oriented, affective or emotional, and traditional.[6] In Tönnies' opinion *Kürwille* was realised in the first of these forms, while *Wesenwille* was realised in the other three (only one of which presupposed the psychological factor as determinant). The

rational work of reason was thus the criterion for distinguishing two types of will and for linking the two types of social structure with them. Underlying Tönnies' analysis of social behaviour was an analysis of the relationship of means and ends, i.e., an *analysis of rationality,* whereas the nature of the social was determined through individuals' 'self-awareness' of themselves and of others as members of society.

Since Tönnies in fact identified will and reason (following Spinoza), this meant that for him the motivation of joint social life, social interaction and 'socialising' (like the formation of the state with Hobbes) did not stem from the tradition hallowed by the Church, as claimed by the political philosophy of reactionary romanticism (and not from God as Hobbes' opponents, the scholastics, had claimed) but from reason.

Tönnies' doctrine of types of will clearly showed his opposition to historising romanticism, and his aspiration to give a rationalist explanation of the nature of social life.

It was not by chance that he gave his main work the sub-title of 'A Theorem of the Philosophy of Culture' (in the first edition). The concepts 'community' and 'society' developed in it became the first step toward developing a formal and, in a certain sense, 'geometricised' conception of sociology, that he himself called pure sociology (later, it began to be treated as formal sociology in the works of historians of social thought, while Tönnies himself was considered the founder of the corresponding 'school').

In his historico-philosophical works Tönnies analysed in detail the notions developed by seventeenth-century thinkers about the features and peculiarities of social knowledge. He considered, for instance, that, according to Hobbes, a pure, i.e., a priori, demonstrative science was possible: (a) about mental things and abstract objects (geometry); (b) about 'political bodies', i.e., about the principles of social institutions produced from human thought that could not be perceived sensually, but the type of which was constructed. Precisely the same principle underlay Tönnies' own scientific teaching. Just as Hobbes and Spinoza were convinced of the boundless possibilities of the *move geometrico,* so Tönnies, too, suggested that a formal deduction of various forms of social life, unaffected by the interests and inclinations of individuals and the selfishness and

aims of groups and classes, would help achieve universal social knowledge of general significance. The word 'theorem' therefore also appeared in his work as affirmation of the rights of conceptual, constructive thinking in opposition to the growing strength of the trends of empiricism and irrationalism.

A paramount requirement of the methods of rationalist methodology was to objectify social phenomena in the sense of ensuring a logically rigorous investigation, and achieving knowledge of general significance. The tools of reification were abstraction, idealisation, and the constructing of ideal types. The types obtained were not erected into absolutes, and reality was not ascribed to them; on the contrary, the types themselves—conceptual 'yardsticks'—were applied to the living reality of social life, opening up opportunities for a proper sociological study of it. That point is particularly important, because, in stressing the impossibility of identifying constructed concepts and empirical reality, Tönnies was trying to put sociology on scientific lines, and was breaking with the age-old tradition of arbitrary philosophico-historical speculation.

Abstraction was thus made the basic principle of sociology. This approach, clearly, was aimed against the historical school and the subjective empiricism of the philosophy of life. Clearly, too, a rehabilitation of rationalism of this kind could lead to rehabilitation of the Enlightenment's idea of natural law and, consequently, to an ignoring of history and development.

Tönnies, however, managed to avoid that danger. The point was that the initial idealisation on which his sociology was based included two abstract concepts rather than one (as, for example, with Hobbes or Locke, or other thinkers of the Enlightenment). Underlying his sociological thinking was the principle of conceptual antinomy: since any concrete manifestation of social will was simultaneously a phenomenon of will and of reason or intellect, so, too, any social formation simultaneously contained features of both community and society.

Community and society thus became the main criterion for the classification of social forms. Tönnies strove in general to work out a developed, ordered system of such criteria. The social entities or forms of social life were divided into three types: (1) social relations, (2) groups, and (3) corporations or associations. Social relations existed not only when they were felt or

realised as such by the individuals involved in them, but also when their necessity was realised; they existed to the extent the mutual rights and obligations of the parties arose from them. In other words, social relations were ones that had an objective character.

The aggregate of social relations between more than two parties was a 'social circle', which was a transition stage from relations to a group. A group was formed when the association of individuals was consciously regarded by them as necessary in order to attain some goal. Furthermore, any social form was called a corporation or association when it possessed internal organisation, i.e., when certain individuals performed certain functions within it, their acts being ones of the corporation.

The division into relations, groups, and associations overlaps with the classification of human relations by the criterion of 'dominance-partnership'. Only then are the types obtained through classification divided by the more general criterion into 'communal' and 'social'.

Tönnies' classification of social norms had exactly the same complex character; they were divided into (1) norms of social order, (2) legal norms, and (3) moral standards. The first were an aggregate of norms of the most general order based primarily on a general agreement or convention. Norms of order were determined by the normative strength of facts. Law, according to him, was created from customs or by way of formal legislation. Morality was established by religion or public opinion. All these standard norms are divided in turn into 'communal' and 'social'. The differences have an 'ideal-typical' or analytical character. They are not encountered in pure form in reality. The normative systems of all social forms, without exception, are composed of aggregates of norms, order, law, and morals.

Tönnies' typology of social values is less complicated.

All these detailed, ramified typological constructs would have an absolutely extra-historical and abstract character if literally each of the forms distinguished were not constantly divided into communal and social manifestations. The application of this principle to the analysis of concrete social phenomena made it possible to catch and conceptually reflect phenomena of historical development; and that was the applied signifi-

cance of these classifications in general and of the concepts of community and society in particular.

Tönnies called analysis of social phenomena from the standpoint of their development applied sociology. Some of his followers treated applied sociology as a scientific philosophy of history. He himself originally defined its aims much more modestly, saying that while pure sociology was limited to comprehending and describing reality statically, in a state of rest, applied sociology dealt with it dynamically, i.e., regarded it in motion.[7] For Tönnies the principle of conceptual antinomy became the method of applied sociology. The dialectical interaction of will and reason that lay at the bottom of social relations developed, according to him, toward a predominance of reason, i.e., social development was a process of increasing rationality.

That defined the direction of social development: from the community to society. The formation of rationality, Tönnies thought, was the formation of society, which developed partly in accordance with the community as the initial, or at least older, form of living together, and partly in crying contradiction with it. From that angle he analysed the dynamics of the development of social structures of various kind, employing considerable factual material, and studied the social problems of contemporaneous society so demonstrating examples of the realisation of his own prescription, namely, to apply the mode of argument underlying this approach to the analysis of any historical situation, and to the development of social life as a whole, at least insofar as this development went from communal to social forms and entities.

This was how Tönnies tackled the main problem of his sociological work, posed by the very course of ideological development in the nineteenth century, namely, the problem of the synthesis of the positive aspects of the Enlightenment and romantic tendencies. The statics and dynamics of social life, the mechanical and organic structure of social 'bodies', and the rational and historical approaches to study of society were equally reflected in his sociology (pure and applied).

Tönnies' sociology made the step from the socio-philosophical speculations characteristic of the preceding period to the developing of an objective, scientific sociology devoid of preconceived value positions and political orientations, and devoid

of the moraliser trend inherent in the philosophy of history. The 'scientific character' of Tönnies' sociology was oriented on a quite definite image of science, namely, the positivist one. In the achievements of his sociological conception he included (1) objectivity, (2) its inherent naturalist tendency, and (3) its independence on value premisses and practical social activity.

The freedom of science in its positivist understanding presupposed freedom from politics. Tönnies posed the question of the relationship of sociology and politics very broadly in general, viz., as a matter of the relation of social theory and social practice, or, in the language of some of the more recent writers, knowledge and interest. Avoidance of value judgements was not, according to him, refusal to study social values. On the contrary, only a sociological, scientific, objective study of values could give politics a reliable basis and develop scientifically substantiated forms of political activity. What one had to do to obtain certain effects had to be demonstrated scientifically, but a number of sciences did not contain such tenets. They were not really sciences, but crafts and technology, he said.[8] Politics was one of these crafts or arts employing data provided by sciences. The difference between them was that science made values the object of study, but politics made them the basis of activity. It was irrelevant, from the scientific standpoint, Tönnies said, or even harmful for the observer, whether a given end was 'wished'. The practician started, however, from what was wished or wanted; he strove for that end, and wanted to know whether it was possible in general to know it with scientific certainty. The scientist dealt with causes and effects. The scientific person only wanted to know; the practical person wanted to act.[9]

The thesis of the freedom of science from politics was also aimed against the political philosophy of romanticism, consciously and purposely oriented on justifying the political actions of the reactionary regimes of Europe.

But, while separating science from politics, Tönnies by no means set himself the aim of separating politics from science. He aspired to make politics 'scientific', and did not want to erect an impassable wall between the two kinds of activity. As will be seen from the arguments referred to above, the cognitive position of the scientist and practical person, described by

Tönnies, was in fact a description of two different cognitive stances followed by one and the same person, who figured now as a politician and now as a sociologist. That form of description was not fortuitous, and can be readily related to Tönnies himself, for he (according to the testimony of contemporaries) combined features of the dispassionate scientist with the passion of a constitutionalist politician, social reformer, and democrat.

Tönnies' practical activity as a politician, and the directions, ends, and means of social work he chose, corresponded in fact to the main tenets of his sociological theory.

The proposition about growth of rationality during social development, formulated in the context of applied sociology, naturally led to a need to fight for democracy against class and feudal prejudices. Because he considered enlightenment and education of the proletariat a necessary stage after the bourgeois enlightenment of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, Tönnies took an active part in the Social-Democratic and labour movement, defended freedom of speech and the right to form trade unions, and came out in support of the strikers during the famous Kiel strike of 1896-97.

His sociological activity lasted more than 50 years, and his theoretical ideas reflected features of the social changes that were taking place in Germany at the turn of the century.

These changes were generated by the consolidation of capitalism in Germany, and its transition to the imperialist stage of capitalist development. While that process proceeded more slowly on the Continent than in the United Kingdom, which had made its bourgeois revolution back in the seventeenth century, the social transformations proceeded even more slowly in Germany, which had been the 'backwoods' of Europe up to then. Territorial fragmentation, the absence of firm statehood, the preservation of a host of feudal and guild survivals all retarded the formation of German imperialism, which only began to develop actively in the 1870s and 1880s.

Tönnies, drawing on the works of English and German ethnologists, jurists, and students of statecraft, registered in the basic concepts of his sociology the main characteristic features of the changes in society's spheres pertaining to constitutional law and value standards typical of this transition period.

He did not bring out the real material basis of these changes,

because of his idealist understanding of the very nature of the social process. It was the factor of thought, he claimed, and consequently of reason, that was the dynamic element in any cultural development, as in the spiritual development of the individual. This meant that it determined individual people's behaviour and thinking to an increasing extent, and also that of the people who constituted groups and associations in their joint activity and common will.[10] That sort of treatment of the nature of the social process naturally ruled out any possibility of knowing the real socio-economic processes underlying historical changes.

Tönnies was well acquainted with the works of Marx analysing the capitalist mode of production. His interest in Marxism, furthermore, had a stable, constant character. On his own recognition, interest in the problems of 'the crisis of culture' had been aroused in him, not least, by reading the first volume of *Capital*, although (he added) Marxism had not had a direct influence on the development of his own ideas.

In fact not only did Marx's principled conclusions prove alien to Tönnies, but also his posing of the problems. In one of his papers Tönnies defined the essence of Marx's theory of society in the spirit of an abstract theory of factors, i.e., social reality was an interaction of three very general factors (economics, politics, and spirit), the development of each of which proceeded independently of the others, but the economic life was a relatively more independent variable. That kind of dogmatic breaking down into factors and variables like the abstract notion of 'economic life' is alien to the spirit of Marxism.

Not recognising the dialectical spirit and wholeness of the nature of Marxism, Tönnies repeatedly counterposed the rigorous theory of Marx, the Marx of *Capital* to the Marx of *The Communist Manifesto*. This counterposing, quite in the liberal-bourgeois spirit, revealed how deeply mistaken Tönnies' ideas about the labour movement and its ideology were. In the end he evaluated Marxism as an 'unquestionably false explanation'.[11]

Tönnies' refusal to see the material patterns at the bottom of social life, and the impossibility in connection with that of accepting class struggle as the dynamic factor of the development of the constitutional-law and value spheres of society considerably reduced the significance of his sociological ideas.

That was why the source of the existence of the community and society as the basic forms of joint human life remained essentially unclarified. Where did the common will (*Wesenwille*) come from, that cemented together and united individuals in the whole of their joint life? How, given the dominance of private will (*Kürwille*) did the mechanical interaction of individuals result in a certain social wholeness or entity? What in general were the factors that constituted this wholeness in each concrete case?[12] Marxism concluded that social will embodied the will of the *class predominant* in society, which determined the structure and forms of the concrete manifestations of human interactions. Tönnies, however, worked out detailed definitions, gave circumstantial descriptions of community and society, but proved unable to disclose the nature of will, i.e., of *social power,* the power of the social whole over the separate individual in each concrete case. Both of the main concepts of his sociology remained postulated rather than deduced from analysis of the reality of social life.

It was this absence of interest in reality, above all in the reality of the interactions, conflicts, and clashes of interests of social groups and classes that caused one of the deficiencies of Tönnies' typology of society, viz., its inadequate description of community. He depicted social relations within a community as relations of agreement and mutual understanding, friendship, co-operation, spiritual friendliness, etc. He ignored everything 'negative' in the emotional sense, and also relations of a conflict nature. R. Koenig justly noted that Tönnies refused to see elements of compulsion in the community. In fact he drew an unhistorical, idealised image of the community, putting a picture with a certain ethical and ideological underlying idea in place of the complex contradictory reality of the relations within a community.

This underlying idea was the reason for the contradictory character of the political sense of Tönnies' doctrine.

There was yet another consequence of the ignoring of conflicts and contradictions in social life, viz., the formal, metaphysical character of Tönnies' complicated and ramified classifications. These were not an end in themselves for Tönnies, of course; they served him for purposes of detailed study of the processes of historical change taking place at various levels

and in various spheres of social life. He himself tried to formalise sociological knowledge and to find some universal system of characteristics applicable to analysis of the most varied spheres of society's life, irrespective of the content of the subject-matter.

Posed that way, however, the problem contained a deep, inner contradiction. It was the formal character of Tönnies' classification and the absence of criteria for singling out the main, determining types of relations and groups which made them useful only for describing processes of change that were really happening, excluding the possibility of developing sociological explanations of history by means of them. In other words, these classifications inevitably degenerated into certain conventions, into a conventional language which could not furnish 'essential', positive knowledge of the reality investigated.

Tönnies's sociological system thus could not serve as an explanation of the processes of historical development.

The 'community-society' typology did not remain an ideologically neutral instrument for describing social processes. However Tönnies tried to stress the neutral-value character of his ideas, and their isolation from philosophy, history, politics, and ethics, the actual content of his works gave grounds for many scholars to interpret his analysis of development from communal to social forms as a hidden philosophy of history, as an ideology of the destruction of culture with a quite definite, reactionary political sense. Such an interpretation proved possible, in fact, because of Tönnies' idealisation, described above, of social relations within a community.

Tönnies was a sociologist who stood at the boundary of two periods of bourgeois sociology. He formed one aspect of his work in the nineteenth century, as was indicated by his striving to develop a 'philosophy of history as sociology' and endeavour to create a broad cultural-historical synthesis and mechanistic theory of social knowledge, and also by the absence of a rigorous differentiation in his theory of sociological ideas proper, and ideas of jurisprudence and constitutional studies.

On the other hand he put forward a number of ideas that were further developed and realised in the Western, non-Marxian sociology of the twentieth century. These were primarily the idea of the analytical (in contrast to historical) structure of so-

ciology, which witnessed to an awareness of it, in itself, as a science, and of its striving to find its own place and its own approach to the analysis of society. Tönnies was one of the first in non-Marxian sociology to pose the problem of social structure, which has come, precisely since then, to be regarded as specially sociological, guaranteeing a special point of view, and a special mode of posing problems. The idea of developing a formal sociology that analysed its subject-matter irrespective of the latter's content was taken up by another notable sociologist of the turn of the century, Georg Simmel, and was later developed by von Wiese, Vierkandt, and several others.

An essential aspect of Tönnies' sociology, furthermore, was his naturalistic theory of social knowledge, which has been continued and developed in many versions in twentieth-century sociology.

Yet the main thing that he bequeathed to the modern sociology of the West was the idea of distinguishing two types of social relations and ties, embodied in the concepts of community and society. These ideas were taken up by Emile Durkheim, who distinguished a society with 'organic' and 'mechanical' solidarity. This typology was applied in an appropriately reworked form, and is still being applied by many Western sociologists, philosophers, and historians, to explain the main conflict of contemporary historical development.

Notes

[1] See Ferdinand Tönnies. *Studien zur Philosophie und Gesellschaftslehre im 17. Jahrhundert.* Edited by E. G. Jacoby (Frommann-Holzboog, Stuttgart, 1975), p 240.

[2] See Ferdinand Tönnies. Die Entstehung meiner Begriff Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft. In: *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie,* 1955, 7, 3: 464.

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] Ferdinand Tönnies. *Community and Association.* Translated by Charles Loomis (Routledge & Kegan Paul, London, 1955), p 119.

[5] See Ferdinand Tönnies. *Einführung in die Soziologie* (Ferdinand Enke Verlag, Stuttgart, 1981), p 6.

[6] Max Weber. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organisation.* Trans-

lated by A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons (OUP, New York, 1947). See also: Lewis A. Coser. *Masters of Sociological Thought* (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, New York, 1977), pp 217-218.

[7] See Ferdinand Tönnies. *Einführung in die Soziologie,* p 316.

[8] See Ferdinand Tönnies. *Soziologische Studien und Kritiken,* Vol. 1 (Verlag von Gustav Fischer, Jena, 1925), p 305.

[9] *Ibid.* p 305.

[10] Ferdinand Tönnies. *Art. cit.,* pp 464-465.

[11] Ferdinand Tönnies. *Einführung in die Soziologie,* p 270.

[12] Both types of social relations are often explained as the product of realising individual mental strivings: instinctive impulses (*Triebwille*) and rationally conditioned impulses (*Zweckwille*). That interpretation, introduced by Wundt, distorts the sense that Tönnies invested the concept of social will with. First, will and intellect are absolutely separated by that (for Tönnies' rationalist treatment of will, see what has been said above). Second, will thereby begins to be treated as a purely psychic formation and the socio-political sense of the concept is eliminated (cf. will of the people, will of the voters), which probably plays a paramount role in Tönnies' system.

9

GEORG SIMMEL'S SOCIOLOGY

Leonid Ionin

Life and Activity

Georg Simmel was born in Berlin in 1858. After the classical secondary school (gymnasium), he matriculated in the philosophy faculty of Berlin University, where his teachers were the historians Mommsen, Steinthal, and Bastian, and the philosopher Eduard Zeller. In his student days his interests were concentrated on philosophy, history, and psychology. In 1881 Simmel received his doctorate in philosophy for a dissertation on Kant; four years later he became a *privat-dozent,* and fifteen years later was elected an 'extraordinary professor' of Berlin University, i.e., an unsalaried professor, who had no pay except students' fees for lectures. Only in 1914, after 30 years of successful teaching and scientific work, did he become a 'full' professor in Strasbourg, where he died in 1918.

During his life Simmel was one of the most popular sociologists of Europe, which he owed not least to his teaching talent, but also to his ability to react instantly and sharply to the pressing problems of social life. Though he did not concern himself with what is now called applied research, Simmel nevertheless knew how to make sociology an 'applied' science, providing explanations that brought out the essence of pressing social problems. Hence also the breadth of his sociological interests (the sociology of art, urban sociology, the sociology of sex,

sociology of science, general sociology, problems of social differentiation, etc.).

Along with Nietzsche, Dilthey, and others, Simmel was a leading spokesman of the so-called philosophy of life. In politics, and in his publicistic activity, he adopted a liberal stance, but during the First World War fell into a kind of chauvinistic blindness. In his book *Der Krieg und die geistigen Entscheidungen* (The War and the Spiritual Decision) (1917) he enthusiastically glorified the 'German spirit'.

Simmel's main sociological works were the following: *Uber soziale Differenzierung* (Social Differentiation) (1890), *Die Probleme der Geschichtsphilosophie* (Problems of the Philosophy of History) (1892), *Philosophie des Geldes* (Philosophy of Money) (1900), *Soziologie. Untersuchungen über die Formen der Vergesellschaftung* (Sociology. Inquiries into the Forms of Sociation) (1908), and *Der Konflikt der modernen Kultur* (The Conflict of Modern Culture) (1918).

Simmel is considered one of the founders of 'formal sociology' along with Tönnies, but the significance of his work goes far beyond the framework of the formal school.

1. The Origin and Main Problem of Sociology

Sociology, Simmel wrote, arose like any other science, from practical necessity 'as a weapon in the struggle for existence'.[1] The sociological posing of problems arose at the turn of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, parallel with the awakening of the masses' political and practical activity in the struggle for their rights against the interests of separate individuals. Because classes whose strength consisted in their 'social being' rather than in the obvious significance of the individual persons drew upon theoretical consciousness, following practical power relations, he wrote, it became understandable all at once that each individual phenomenon was determined by an immensity of influences from the human environment.[2]

It was then that the society of the past 'arose', along with the society of the present, and later, too, 'society in general', as a substance forming individual existence 'like the sea forms waves'. And it was then that the idea of the social essence of

man and of historical events took shape, and the traditional 'sciences of society' got the opportunity of a new approach to the still unresolved problems bothering them.

Simmel suggested, however, that sociology did not exist as a special science in that period because it lacked a special object, which would arise from observation of the traditional objects of social knowledge 'from a new angle'. For that purpose it was also necessary to distinguish the concept of society as such, which existed apart from any phenomena and any given socio-historical moment, i.e., a concept of society as an aggregate of pure forms of sociation (*Vergesellschaftung*).[3]

2. Form and Content. The Project of Formal Sociology

The concept of form and its closely linked concept of content are the most important ones in Simmel's *pure, or formal sociology*.

In one of his earlier works he proposed to regard the history of society as that of psychic or mental phenomena. Each psychic phenomenon had to be taken in two aspects: on the one hand, as a psychic act presenting itself as a wish, remembrance, affirmation, etc.; on the other hand, as what is desired, remembered, asserted, etc., in each such act. When we isolated this latter aspect of a psychic act, Simmel considered, we got the objective content of consciousness, which was in no way psychological. This content was what was understood in the philosophy of life as 'experience' (*Erlebnis*); according to Simmel it was the 'matter' or 'body' of the social.

Form, in turn, was best defined by the tasks it performed. These, according to Simmel, were the following: (1) form related several contents together in such a way that they formed a unity; (2) in acquiring form these contents were separated off from other contents; (3) forms structured the contents that they relate mutually to one another. What we call form, Simmel said, is the *unification* of material from the angle of the function it performs; it breaks down the isolation of the parts that compose it. The whole, as a unity of these parts, is opposed to any other material that does not possess form or is formed otherwise.[4]

As regards sociology the counterposing of form and content should thus be understood as a counterposing of the 'matter' of social interaction (the culturally, historically conditioned products of the human mind; the aims, aspirations, and needs of individuals) and the interaction structures most often repeated and characteristic of all cultural, historical events and phenomena of any sort.

Human society, according to Simmel, arose in the combination and aggregate of these structures. The job of formal sociology was consequently not to divide whole social formations into two parts, but to single out those aspects of them that constituted society as an interpersonal, interindividual phenomenon. He did not try to compile an exhaustive 'catalogue' of human relationships (though he was often reproached for doing so, incidentally). On the contrary, he considered that pure formal concepts were of limited value, and that the project of formal sociology would only be realised adequately when the singling out of pure forms of sociation was accompanied with an explanation of what they meant as pure forms of human behaviour, under what circumstances they arose, how they developed, what changes they underwent owing to the peculiarities of their object and from what simultaneous, formal, and material attributes of the society they arose or declined.[5] In other words, each form of sociation, when identified as such, should become the object of a historical, meaningful description.

3. Patterns of Social Forms

Simmel did not leave a systematic classification of social forms, but he did make several aspects of social life the subject of his research, singling them out as forms from their 'live' reality: dominance, subordination, rivalry, division of labour, formation of parties, and so on. All these forms, he suggested, were reproduced, and filled with an appropriate content, in various types of group and social organisation, which could in turn be treated as forms (in the state and a religious community, in a group of conspirators, in a business association, in the family, in an art school, and so on). He gave examples of the study of these and similar forms in the papers that constituted one of his best known works *Soziologie*.

Three groups of forms could be distinguished: social processes, social types, and models of development. Social processes included phenomena that were constant irrespective of the concrete circumstances of their realisation (such as subordination, domination, rivalry, conciliation, etc.).

An example of a *social process* was a universal phenomenon like fashion. Vogue or fashion, Simmel considered, simultaneously presupposed both imitation and individualisation (which in turn represented forms of social processes). A person following the fashion simultaneously both differentiated himself/herself from others, and asserted his/her membership of a certain stratum or group.

Simmel demonstrated the impossibility of fashion without a striving for individualisation by the point that in primitive societies, characterised by maximum social uniformity, in which there was no striving to be singled out from the general mass, there was also no fashion. Just as in any society governed by a comparatively small group of people, members of the ruling oligarchy wore an identical, strict dress, not wanting to demonstrate their exclusiveness vis-à-vis the general mass of citizens (an example was the Venetian doges, who always wore black).

The impossibility of fashion without a striving toward imitation, and to merge with the collectivity, was proved by the fact that there was no fashion in societies characterised by a breakdown of group standards. In Florence of the Trecento, for example, everyone followed his/her own style of dress; there was no vogue because there was no striving to merge with the collectivity.

As soon as any phenomenon (dress, ideas, manners, things, etc.) become 'fashionable' they then begin 'to go out of fashion'. It is also the fascination of fashion that it is simultaneously new and passing. Fashion gives a feeling of the present, and a sensation of the passage of time. A reason for the very wide spread of fashion in modern times, Simmel said, was precisely the dissolution of old convictions, habits, and traditions, rooted in faith and belief, as a result of which temporary, transient forms became more active. Hence, too, the dominating influence of fashion in art, the sciences, even in morals.

Yet, in spite of the transient character of any concrete

fasion, it has a certain constancy as a social form: fashion has always existed in one form or another.[6]

The second category of social forms was the *social type.* A person involved in a certain kind of relation acquired certain characteristic qualities essential for him, i.e., that were constantly displayed irrespective of the nature of any specific interaction. Examples of social type studied by Simmel were the cynic, the poor, the coquette, the aristocrat, etc.

As in the example of fashion cited above, Simmel's thought moved dialectically when characterising social types by a distinguishing of characteristic contradictions. The daily life of a social type like the aristocrat, for example, was a unity of two mutually exclusive characteristics: on the one hand, he was absolutely absorbed in his group and family tradition, because he was a limb of the family tree; on the other hand, he was an absolute separate from the group and even opposed to it, because strength, independence, and personal responsibility were the nub of the tradition characteristic of the aristocracy.[7]

An example of social forms belonging to the third group, known as *models of development,* was the universal process of the connection between the extension or expansion of a group and the intensification of individuality.

As a group increased, Simmel wrote, its members became less and less like one another. The increase in individuality was accompanied with degradation of the group. The smaller, i.e., the more peculiar, a group was, on the contrary, the less individual its members were. History developed toward an increase in individuality at the expense of the individuals' loss of their unique social characteristics: the extended family was replaced by independent, equal individuals and the nuclear family; guild and blood-relation organisation was replaced by civil society with its characteristic high individual responsibility.[8]

Social forms could be classified in a different way—by their degree of remoteness from directly meaningful, psychological manifestations. Such spontaneous forms as exchange, personal bent, imitation, and forms connected with the behaviour of crowds, etc., Simmel thought, were least separated from content. Stabler, more independent forms, such as economic and other formal organisations (formal in the now customary, sociological sense, and not in Simmel's) were somewhat further re-

moved from the social 'matter' and the social content.

Finally, Simmel's 'play' forms were the furthest from the spontaneousness of social life. They were 'pure forms of sociation' that are not mental abstractions but forms really existing (or rather really encountered) in social life. They were pure because the content that once 'filled' them had disappeared. Examples were the following: that which was understood by the 'old regime', i.e., a political form that had outlived its time and did not meet the needs of the individuals involved in it; 'science for science's sake', i.e., knowledge isolated from human needs, that had ceased to be a 'weapon in the struggle for existence'; 'art for art's sake', etc.

'Free sociability' (*Geselligkeit*) was a 'play' form exceptional in its role and significance. It was sociability for sociability's sake, arranged without no other purpose than to enjoy company and be with others. That kind of intercourse was a play form of sociation or an abstract model of the social process without any meaningful elements. Individuals entered into it as 'formal' individuals lacking any meaningful characteristics (such as capability, wealth, status, power or authority, beliefs or convictions, etc.); this sociability was the intercourse of 'equals'. Tact was the means of ensuring this equality; it limited any kind of meaningful aspirations and impulses of the parties; it was tactless to talk 'shop' at an evening party, to discuss abstract problems, to show off one's wit or one's wealth. Tact, consequently, was a play or game form of social standards. Flirtation or coquetry was a game form of sexual relations, impersonal, 'empty', without real erotic content. The conversation at such a party was an end in itself; its theme, of course, was not a matter of indifference, but the main thing was not the theme, nor its content, but the satisfaction from the general conversation itself, from talk and conversation that embodied free sociability, i.e., intercourse for intercourse's sake.[9]

4. Philosophical Sociology. The Theory of Understanding

Simmel demonstrated the idea of pure sociology most fully and consistently in his analysis of free sociability. But in it he also

exhausted this idea by demonstrating its limits. Pure sociology, he considered, was only possible along with a *philosophical sociology* that set theoretical-cognitive and socio-philosophical guideposts for pure sociology, endowing it with terms and conditions, fundamental ideas, and premisses unrelated to experience and the direct object of knowledge, and having no place within them.[10]

Simmel posed the problems of the connection of sociology and philosophy, and of its philosophical foundation, as problems (a) of the development of a sociological theory of knowledge and (b) the creation of a historical sociology or, as he himself put it, a social metaphysics.

He considered the *theory of historical understanding* a specific theory of knowledge of social phenomena. He regarded this theory, which he had already developed in *Problems of the Philosophy of History*, as a philosophical methodology of cognition that served as a guide for applying general scientific methods like induction, typologising, etc., during sociological analysis. In addition, understanding served as the connecting link between pure or formal sociology and social philosophy. It was a means of historical comprehension of the data and facts accessible to formal sociology.

Essentially hypothetical formations that are perceived and discussed as historical truths arise, Simmel wrote, only in the mental activity of the researcher, who orders the facts in accordance with the prevailing ideas and values, puts them into combinations from which arise solutions of problems that could not even have been posed if the researcher had relied only and exclusively on the initial series of experience, and only in such activity.

This 'mental activity' was essentially an activity of understanding and its directing and organising—and regulating—principle was the 'whole image' of the social world that figured in the image of historical sociology.

5. Historical Sociology

Underlying historical sociology are the ideas of the development of society as a functional differentiation accompanied

with a simultaneous integration of its various elements that were characteristic of nineteenth-century evolutionism. This was due to the influence of positivist evolutionism which had predominated in the initial stage of Simmel's philosophical and sociological work.

When describing above the type of the forms of sociation studied by Simmel that he called the model of development, I pointed out that according to him the size of a group correlates closely with the degree of development of the individuality of its members. In the same way, he added, the size of a group is directly proportional to the degree of freedom enjoyed by its members; the smaller the group, the more unitely it must function and the closer its members cling together so as to defend its integrity against adverse effects of the environment.

With quantitative growth of a group, the permissible boundaries and limits of the identification of its members as such were widened, and consequently opportunities opened up for a variation of individuality; and the degree of individual freedom increased. Widening or extension of a group led to realisation of the spatial aspect of sociation, which led in turn (as regards the processes of development of the psyche) to the development of a capacity for abstraction; an increase in the number of individuals in a group, accompanied with a differentiation of its elements, generated a mental capacity for associations. Intellect, and a capacity for consciousness, thus arose.[11]

The rise and development of intellect went hand in hand with the origin and development of a money economy. The appearance of money as a universal means of exchange was also governed by the historical process of spatial extension and inevitable differentiation of economic units. Money, like intellect, developed parallel with growth of freedom and increasing individualisation of the members of social groups (through division of labour).[12]

The rise of consciousness and development of money marked the onset of society in its 'historical' period.

According to Simmel the history of society was the history of increasing intellectualisation (i.e., in essence, rationalisation) of social life and deepening of the influence of the principles of a money economy. In other words, he identified the history

of society with the history of the moulding of modern capitalism, in which the characteristic general features of money and intellect are most fully developed.

In his book on Kant, when discussing the intellectualism of Kant's philosophy, Simmel wrote that intellectualism was displayed, on the one hand, in the modern importance of science (and indeed not just in its actual development but even more in belief in it), in the fullness of life, since perfect science can govern it, a belief that grows steadily in the clash of Liberalism and Socialism. On the other hand, Simmel thought, the all-pervading money economy demonstrated in practice the domination of the intellectual principle; undeclining logical consistency, rejection of all subjectivity, accessibility in principle for everyone—were all characteristics of the money economy of modern times, and of its intellectuality.[13]

In contrast to other theorists of the 'capitalist spirit', Simmel did not link the rise of the money economy and intellectualism with modern times and the origin of the capitalist economy and ideology. It was a much more general concept, a kind of 'evolutionary universal', whose level of development characterised the different epochs of human history.

Intellectualism and the money economy were the guiding concepts of Simmel's historical-sociological conception. At the same time he treated them as the most abstract of the forms of socialisation. Simmel devoted the concluding chapter of his *Philosophy of Money* to an analysis of these forms; that chapter is, in essence, a phenomenology of the capitalist way of life.

6. Analysis of the 'Spirit of Modernity'

Simmel considered the absence of certain qualitative traits, of an expressed nature to be the prime, main feature equally characterising both these forms.

> The intellect, as a pure concept, [he wrote], is absolutely lacking in character, not in the sense of being deficient in some necessary quality, but because it exists completely apart from the selective one-sidedness that determines character.[14]

The same also applied to money.

> There is obviously a lack of character in money too. Just as money *per se* is the mechanical reflex of the relative value of things and is equally useful to everyone, so within money transaction all persons are of equal value, not because all but because none is valuable except money.[15]

Intellect built a mechanistic image of the world with ruthless logic, driving out the naive subjectivism and direct comprehension inherent in preceding periods, replacing them by the objectivity of the logical method.

Quality was lowered; the depth and fullness of mental experience characteristic of the past disappeared, of that past when

> even such an intellectually outstanding and theoretically committed person as Dante tells us that one should respond to certain theoretical opponents not with arguments but only with the knife.[16]

The present spread of intellect—the all-determining spirit—ensured ease of understanding of one another by people of the most varied origin and cast of mind, an ease whose reverse became a levelling and lowering of the general standard of intellectual life.

In exactly the same way, Simmel wrote, money, in the inexorable unequivocalness of its effects ruled out display of any kind of the naturalness and spontaneity so characteristic of the past. Universal alienation reigned; money deprived the thing produced of its purposeful character and converted it into a means (the worker proved alienated from the product of his labour); money separated the individual spatially, and then spiritually from the things belonging to him, which ceased to be part of his Ego, and the owner was alienated from possession; the subjective personal element disappeared from the relations of those who governed and those who were governed, subordination became a part of technological necessity, a requirement of 'business'—and individuals were alienated from one another in production, and so on.

Universal alienation was accompanied with a growth of individual freedom.

> Since freedom means independence from the will of others, it commences with independence from the will of specific individuals. The lonely settler in the German or American forests is non-dependent; the inhabitants of a modern metropolis are independent in the positive sense of the word, and even though they require innumerable suppliers, workers and cooperators and would be lost without them, their relationship to them is completely objective and is only embodied in money.[17]

Alienation and freedom were two sides of the same medal.

People lost the qualities of their individuality during the course of this universal alienation, passed into 'uniformity' or 'one-dimensionality', and ceased to be preferring and preferred. Prostitution became the symbol of interpersonal relations.

When Kant was formulating his categorical imperative, he pointed out that a person should never regard another person as a means, but should consider him as an end, and act accordingly. Prostitution was behaviour that completely contradicted that principle. In prostitution the person was a means, as regards both parties. Simmel saw profound historical sense in the fact that prostitution was linked in a very deep way with the money economy.

Money also ruins the nature of things by its very touch.

> Yet at that moment at which things that are viewed according to their money value are so evaluated, they are removed from the realm of this category, their qualitative value is subordinated to their quantitative value and their total independence—the dual relationship to others and to itself—that we experience on a certain level as distinction has lost its basis. The essence of prostitution, which we recognized in money, is imparted to the objects...[18]

Simmel studied the social function of money and of logical consciousness in all their diverse and finest mediations and manifestations: in modern democracy, in formal law, in the ideology of liberalism, in the omnipotence of science, in the development of technology, in the trends of artistic taste, in the favourite motifs and compositions of artistic works, and finally in the very rhythm and tempo of modern life. In all fields and spheres of joint human existence he discovered a 'stylistic' unity of

modern culture, governed by the nature of these two of its guiding factors.

Objectivity is the style of modern culture—the objectivity of money opposed to any meaningful, subjectively governed characteristic of possession, which makes it absolutely independent of any possibility of using it; the objectivity of logical forms that exist independently of the content that fills them, and which recognise the possible formal correctness of any judgment, even a senseless and false one; in some sense or other the objectivity of modern law is similar to it, with the invulnerable formal correctness of created, sometimes flagrant, content-rich or, as Simmel put it, material injustice. Such were the paradoxes that arose from the development and combination of the two main factors and that, according to Simmel, determined the sense of the present time.

This sense was the increasing 'devastation' of the fundamental forms of sociation, their divorce from content, and their conversion into self-sufficing 'play' forms, in short the relativisation of cultural content.

The emancipated individual was alienated from the objectivity of the human spirit.

> Just as the absolutist view of the world represents a definite stage of intellectual development in correlation with the corresponding practical, economic and emotional conditions of human affairs, so the relativistic view of the world seems to express the momentary relationship of adjustment on the part of our intellect. More accurate, it is confirmed by the opposing image of social and subjective life, in which money has found its real effective embodiment and the reflected symbol of its forms and movements.[19]

So *Philosophy of Money* was completed on a lofty note of conscious and consistent relativism.

7. A Critical Assessment of Simmel's Sociology

The structure of Simmel's sociological conception reflected the relativistic ideas, characteristic of his time about the structure of knowledge in general and about the structure of social

knowledge in particular. These ideas were a consequence of the incorrect conclusions he drew from his comprehension of the real facts of the scientific and social development of his time.

At the beginning of his philosophical work, which adhered to the cognitive precepts characteristic of a positivistically oriented naturalism, Simmel perceived the collapse of the dogmas of traditional science extremely sharply. The revolution in natural science that occurred at the turn of the century, and the 'crisis of physics' were undoubtedly facts that pushed him to a relativistic position.

But the facts of the social development of that time played the greatest role in shaping his socio-philosophical ideas. The turn of the century—the period when capitalist society entered the epoch of imperialism—was characterised by a radical sharpening of all the contradictions initially inherent in the social system of capitalism. A result of that was a degradation of each and every cultural standard and a relativising of the way of life associated with it.

Simmel gave a brilliant description of this process from the 'inside', from the position of a participant in the happenings. He demonstrated the phenomenon of the 'devastation' of social forms no longer capable of containing the material motion of things. But he was not able to give an objective explanation of the process because he took up a relativistic, subjectivist position.

He also did not accept the Marxian explanation of the 'conflict of modern culture'. The Marxist conception of socio-economic development was dogmatic and non-reflexive, he said, relating Marxism to versions of 'historical realism' whose 'constructed' nature his theory of historical understanding was meant to explain.

But he very highly appreciated Marx's dialectical analysis of the role of money in the transformations of bourgeois consciousness, Marx's conception of alienation, and Marx's study of bourgeois ideological doctrines. The impact of Marx's thought is to be felt in many pages of *Philosophy of Money*.

While discovering a 'positive content' in historical materialism, Simmel considered it the task of his own socio-philosophical conception

to construct a new storey beneath historical materialism such that the explanatory value of the incorporation of economic life into the causes of intellectual culture is preserved, while these economic forms themselves are recognized as the result of more profound valuations and currents of psychological or even metaphysical preconditions.[20]

In other words, he proposed to make the truths won by historical materialism relative, i.e., in fact to deprive it of its firm, materialist foundation. His attempt to 'improve' Marxism was, in fact, a fight against it. This aspiration of Simmel's was quite explicable, when we note the opposition of his own relativist approach and the Marxian objective one to the study of social life.

8. The Scientific Significance of Simmel's Conception

Simmel gave an impressive description in his sociology of the pernicious consequences of capitalist business activity and the very deep contradictions of capitalist civilisation in the realms of culture. His *Philosophy of Money*, the first edition of which appeared in 1900, became the first of an endless series of works by various authors devoted to analysing the 'spirit of capitalism'. Sombart's *Der moderne Kapitalismus* (Modern Capitalism), Max Weber's *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (and a number of his essays on the sociology of religion), the works of Stammler, Troeltsch, Scheler, and even, later, of Spengler, (who provided a theory of capitalism in the second volume of his *The Decline of the West*), and of the sociologists and philosophers of the anthropological trend (Gehlen, Plessner, Rothacker), and in Horkheimer and Adorno's *Dialektik der Aufklärung* (Dialectics of Education), and other works of the critical philosophers and sociologists of the Frankfort school, all appeared after Simmel's, but far from all of them contained so sharp a criticism of the spiritual system of capitalism. One can agree with the German writer Woyslawski, who wrote about *Philosophy of Money* that the whole book, in spite of the absence of an ethical feel, and the abstract 'impersonalness' of its style, sounded from start to finish like an arraignment.[21] Many of these authors had to experience the horror of fascism

in order to understand how capitalism corrupts the soul and spirit of people.

Simmel's historical, sociological conception, and his analysis of the 'spirit of modern times', made him one of the founders of the critical tradition in Western sociology.

As I have shown above, Simmel interpreted formal sociology as a concrete science of society that took its world-outlook sense and main theoretical and methodological guidelines from philosophical sociology. That approach was quite legitimate in itself. One must not forget that it was developed at a time when the need to shape sociology as an independent science compelled even the most abstractly thinking theorists to proclaim their rejection of philosophy, and of every kind of 'speculation' and 'metaphysics'. It was then, too, that the ideal of neutral-value knowledge, traditional in Western sociology, and quite impracticable in practice, took shape.

Simmel did not try to combine the social-philosophy (historical) and formal-sociological approaches. He set himself the task 'of finding in each of life's details the totality of its meaning'.[22] He did not manage to disclose the full sense, rooted in the history of material production, of both the historical process and its modern stage, and consequently to provide a fully adequate explanation of the partial facts of social life, but his aspiration to base analytical study of society's life on a foundation of historical vision deserves a positive evaluation. What he did in that direction, it has transpired, was largely lost by non-Marxian sociology in the subsequent stages of its development.

There has been a marked revival of interest in Simmel's sociological work in the West in recent decades. One can even speak of a 'Simmel revival'. The most important reason for it, one can say, is lack of confidence in the apologetically oriented official branch of sociology and the growth within it of alternative, socio-critical trends. In that sense Simmel is a modern thinker even today.

Notes

[1] Georg Simmel. *Soziologie. Untersuchungen über die Formen der Vergesellschaftung* (Verlag von Duncker & Humblot, Munich, 1922), p 1.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] *Ibid.*, p 4.

[4] See Georg Simmel. *Kant* (Verlag von Duncker & Humblot, Leipzig, 1904) p 38.

[5] See Georg Simmel. *Soziologie*, pp 10-11.

[6] Georg Simmel. *Philosophische Kultur: Gesammelte Essais* (Kröner, Leipzig, 1919).

[7] See Georg Simmel. *Soziologie*, p 34.

[8] *Ibid.*, pp 527-532.

[9] See Georg Simmel. *Grundfragen der Soziologie (Individuum und Gesellschaft)*, 2nd ed. (Walter de Gruyter & Co., Berlin, 1920), pp 50-71.

[10] *Ibid.*, p 31.

[11] See Georg Simmel. *Soziologie*, p 480.

[12] *Ibid.*, p 553.

[13] Georg Simmel. *Kant*, p 7.

[14] Georg Simmel. *Philosophy of Money*. Translated by Tom Bottomore and David Frisby (Routledge & Kegal Paul, London, 1978), p 432.

[15] *Ibid.*

[16] *Ibid.*

[17] *Ibid.*, p 300.

[18] *Ibid.*, p 392.

[19] *Ibid.*, p 512.

[20] *Ibid.*, p 56.

[21] Hersch-Leib Woyslawski. *Georg Simmels Philosophie des kapitalistischen Geistes* (Druck von Arthur Schplem, Berlin, 1931), p 13.

[22] Georg Simmel. *Philosophy of Money*, p. 55.

10

EMILE DURKHEIM'S SOCIOLOGY

Elena Osipova

1. Durkheim's Socio-Political Position

The last quarter of the nineteenth century was marked in France by capitalism's entry into the imperialist stage with its inherent phenomena of economic, political, and spiritual crisis. The socio-economic system could not ensure its own stable existence and was constantly being threatened by revolutionary actions of the masses of the working people. And clerical-monarchical circles were struggling against the bourgeois republicans, striving to restore the reactionary social order.

The spiritual mainstay of reaction was the spiritualistic philosophy. At the same time there was a noticeable strengthening of the influence of Comtean positivism in various fields of spiritual culture at the end of the century. The idea that sociology was an independent science that should become the basis for a reorganisation of society gradually found support among the republicans who were putting forward a programme of socio-political reforms.

Between 1870 and 1914 sociological thought developed in several directions in France. One of these was headed by the followers of Le Play, who made monographic studies of the economic and family position of various groups of the population. Ideologically the Le Playists were very conservative, and saw support for the shaky social order in religion.

'Social statisticians', for the most part civil servants, made

empirical studies for various public institutions.

The sociologists of the various positivist orientations were grouped around René Worms' *International Journal of Sociology*. A leading place among them was taken by Tarde, Kovalevsky, Novicow, de Roberty, and other active members of the Paris Sociological Society and the International Institute of Sociology.

'Catholic sociologists', adherents of Thomism, took up a theological position.

But none of these trends could serve as the theoretical basis of bourgeois republicans' socio-political aspirations. The theoretical and methodological conception called 'sociologism', which found its fullest expression in the writings of Emile Durkheim (1858-1917), became the theoretical foundation of their policy and the ideology of social reformism, a necessary premiss of which was 'class peace' and *consensus universalis.*

After studying philosophy in the Ecole Normale Superieure in Paris, Durkheim began to teach in provincial lycées, at the same time reading the sociological literature and contributing as a reviewer to philosophical journals. After visiting Germany to acquaint himself with the state of philosophy, the social sciences, and ethics there, he was invited in 1887 to teach a course of social sciences in the University of Bordeaux. In 1896 he became the head of the first French chair of pedagogy and social science, in the university.

A group of pupils and followers gathered around Durkheim: Marcel Granet, Célestin Bouglé, Georges Davy, François Simiand, Paul Fauconnet, Maurice Halbwachs, Marcel Mauss. In 1896 Durkheim began publishing *L'Année sociologique,* in collaboration with them, which had great influence on the development of French social studies.

The ideological and theoretical sources of Durkheim's scientific work and teaching were the conceptions of the Enlightenment, especially those of Montesquieu, Condorcet, and Rousseau, and also the ideas of Saint-Simon and Comte. Kant's ethics had a big influence on him, and also Wundt's folk psychology, and certain ideas of the German historical school of jurisprudence.

Durkheim published his first three major works in the 1890s. In his doctoral dissertation *The Division of Labor in Society*

(1893) he set out his socio-political platform subsequently concretised and refined both by himself and by his 'school'. The second work *The Rules of the Sociological Method* (1895) was devoted to substantiating the theoretical and methodological conceptions of 'sociologism'.[1] *The Rules* prepared the ground for constituting sociology as an independent discipline. In his sociological study *Suicide* (1897) Durkheim undertook to unite the theoretical approach to the explanation of this phenomenon with an analysis of the empirical data, which served as the basis for the theoretical hypothesis.

In 1902 Durkheim was invited to the Sorbonne, and from 1906 was Professor of the chair of the Science of Education. In 1913 his chair was renamed that of the Science of Education and Sociology.

For fiftieen years after his move to Paris he was occupied with teaching, and with developing sociological problems of morality and education. The results of this work were the following books: *Education et sociologie* (1922), *Moral Education* (1925), *L'evolution de pedagogique en France* (1938) and *Leçon de sociologie* (1950).

His many years' study of problems of religion were crowned by a work devoted to Australian totemism *The Elementary Forms of Religious Life* (1912).

Durkheim's 'sociological school' won itself a firm position in French social studies, but his work was interrupted by the First World War. He responded to the war by taking part in public activity for the 'moral inspiration' of the nation. While denying the imperialist nature of the war as regards the Allies, in particular France, he denounced Germany's imperialist aims, and her drive for world hegemony.[2]

Feeling the crisis of capitalist society acutely, and trying to combat it by sociologically based plans of social reconstruction and correction, Durkheim wanted to create a new bourgeois ideology that would have a scientific character. In accordance with the positivist conception a scientific sociology should become a new symbol of faith, an ideology, even a 'religion' of contemporary society. The measures and means proposed by Durkheim to tackle socio-political problems, based on the idea of class solidarity, were aimed at peaceful settlement of the contradiction between labour and capital. He tried to sub-

stantiate the capitalist slogan, of social solidarity, popular at the time, and based all his teaching on the ideas of the positivist conception of science.

While campaigning for secularisation of school and university education, and for liberation of social and intellectual life from clerical influence, Durkheim constantly opposed the pervasive dominant influence of clericals and made no small contribution to substantiating the policy of separation of Church and state, and of the school from the Church, which was crowned by passing of the appropriate legislation in 1905.

While rejecting revolution, Durkheim called for the organisation of trade syndicates that would, in his view, improve public morals, and for educational reform. The trade syndicates or corporations, covering whole branches of labour, and uniting capitalists and workers in a single public body dealing with all the problems both of the trade or profession and of its relations with other professional associations, would, in Durkheim's view, help the government to settle social problems and regulate all types of human activity.

He did not understand the complexity of the growing socialist movement and the radical differences between the numerous groupings of its members. His attitude to socialism, therefore, was (1) undifferentiated, (2) marked by sympathy for certain socialistic ideas, in particular those of Saint-Simon, and (3) characterised by lack of understanding of the class essence of Marx's scientific socialism and by rejection of the significance of class struggle.

Durkheim maintained close relations with Jaurès, the leader of French socialists. Their views undoubtedly coincided on a number of points and they influenced each other. Many of the members of Durkheim's school were close to reformist socialism of a Jaurès type. Marcel Mauss, François Simiand, and Lucien Lévy-Bruhl were members of the Socialist Party. Some of them were involved in the founding of *L'Humanité*, then the organ of the Socialist Party, and contributed to it. Many of the Durkheimians taught in the Socialist School whose aim was propaganda for socialism among the workers. It is not surprising that certain public circles in the Third Republic understood sociology almost as a synonym of socialism.

In the 1890s the influence of Marxism began to grow among

certain sections of the French working-class movement. Translations of the works of Engels, Karl Kautsky, and Labriola appeared. Durkheim's response to socialism's attraction for many students was his lectures of 1895-96 on socialism. He intended, starting with Saint-Simon, to survey the theories of Proudhon, Lassalle, and Marx, but was unable to carry out his plan completely.

He recognised socialism as a movement of great social significance. Socialists, especially Saint-Simon and Marx, he wrote, recognised that modern society differed radically from the traditional type of social order, and had formulated a programme of social reorganisation so as to overcome the crisis caused by the transition from the old to the new. Socialism was an ideal that grew from a feeling of justice, and of sympathy for the poverty of the working class. 'It was above all a plan for the reconstruction of societies, a program for a collective life which does not exist as yet ... and which is proposed to men as worthy of their preference'.[3] Socialism was a 'cry of grief, and sometimes of anger, uttered by men who felt most keenly our collective malaise'.[4]

In defining socialism as a practical doctrine requiring conscious subordination of all economic functions to society's guiding centres,[5] he mistakenly interpreted it as an exclusively economic theory that allegedly paid no attention to moral problems.

Although he recognised that many socialists, and especially Karl Marx, had linked their fate inseparably with defence of the interests of the working class, Durkheim all the same suggested that this was a secondary matter not inherent in their theories. He rejected the need to abolish classes, and did not consider the thesis of 'class conflict' to be important in principle, since improvement of the workers' lot would come of itself as a simple consequence of reform of the social system.

In making the economic content of socialism an absolute, and criticising it on that basis for underestimating the moral factor, Durkheim considered communism (early communist doctrines) as an exclusively moral doctrine preaching asceticism, as a dream that expressed the nobility of its creators' mind and because of that had an attractive force. But this teaching, in his view, did not correspond to the needs of society since prosperi-

ty and wealth should be the social ideal, and not universal restraint and poverty.

Durkheim's misunderstanding of scientific socialism was due to his class position. Optimistically evaluating the possibilities of capitalism's development of the whole, he counted the social phenomena on whose soil scientific socialism had grown as a 'social pathology' that could be 'cured' by reforms, and reduced the social problem to a moral one.

His socio-political position had a conciliatory, utopian character. His efforts as an ideologist and theorist were directed to looking for a third way between clerical royalism and socialism, and to substantiating social reformism. The quest was not crowned by any serious results.

2. The Subject-Matter of Sociology and Its Place Among the Other Social Sciences

Among the general conditions needed to convert sociology into an independent science, Durkheim saw the existence of a special subject-matter studied exclusively by a science, and a corresponding method of investigation. Sociology, he suggested, should study social reality which had special qualities inherent only in it. The elements of social reality were social facts, the aggregate of which was society. These facts constituted the subject-matter of sociology.

In his definition, a social fact is 'any manner of action, fixed or not, susceptible to exert an external constraint on the individual ... and having its own existence independent of its individual manifestations'.[6] The individual found, from birth, ready-made laws and customs, rules of conduct, religious beliefs and rituals, language, and a monetary system that operated independently of him/her. These ways of thinking, acting, and feeling existed independently and objectively.

Another characteristic of social facts, viz., the pressure exerted on individuals, and compelling them to a certain action, was a consequence of the facts' objectivity. Durkheim wrote in explanation of this that everybody experienced social compulsion or coercion. Legal and moral rules, for example, could not be broken without the individual feeling the whole weight of uni-

versal disapproval. It was exactly the same with other types of social facts.

In a certain sense Durkheim counterposed facts, understood as forms of social being, or facts of a morphological order, to the facts of collective consciousness, which he called the collective ideas that were the essence of morality, religion, and law.

Social morphology should study the structure and form of the parts of society, or its 'anatomical structure', constituted by demographic and ecological facts, i.e., the 'substratum' of collective notions.

Morphological facts included the number and character of the principal elements of society, the means of combining them, their degree of cohesion and solidarity, the territorial distribution of population, the character of communications, the form of housing, etc.[7] They constituted, as it were, the 'material', quantitative aspect of society, while the facts of collective consciousness, i.e., collective ideas, were its spiritual, qualitative aspect.

Durkheim called morphological facts and collective ideas 'the inner social environment', which was characterised by the number of individuals per unit of area ('material density') and the degree of concentration of the 'mass' ('dynamic density'), which was expressed in the intensity of individuals' social intercourse, and the frequency of their contacts, which determined the 'quality of life as a whole'.

The contradiction in Durkheim's answers to these matters is a clear example of his philosophical inconsistency. Thus, when pointing out the determinant influence of the social environment, he included both material and ideal facts in the concept. But when stressing the capacity of collective consciousness to produce other social facts, and even to create society, he ascribed a self-sufficient, autonomous character to it, never posing the question of the limits or relativity of this autonomy. His use of the concept of a 'material substratum' of social affairs by no means signified an approximation to understanding the actual material foundation of society, its basis. His depreciation of the importance of economic relations, and interpretation of them as relations of benefit and interest, led him to a miscomprehension of the role of production labour. Like most pre-Marxian materialists he considered matter a synonym for a physical body,

and therefore could not see any 'matter' in society other than what was embodied in ecological, demographic, and technological facts.

At the same time one must note his striving to put sociology on a firmer foundation than that of psychology, and to find a starting point for a sociological explanation of the diversity of social phenomena.

Inconsistency apart, the chief drawback of Durkheim's treatment of the problem of social facts as the subject-matter of sociology, was his lack of understanding of the importance of investigating their epistemological nature, which led, when he was making a theoretical analysis of such a phenomenon as religion, to errors of principle.

In Durkheim's conception sociology had a central place in the social sciences. Its job was not only to investigate social facts, but to equip all the other social sciences with a method and a theory on which investigations in various fields of social life could be based. The different social sciences were sections or branches as it were of sociology that studied collective ideas in their concrete (legal, moral, religious, economic) form. Spokesmen of the different disciplines should be united by a common point of view on the character of social facts, the common criteria for evaluating them, and the general method of investigation. Only then would sociology cease to be an abstract, metaphysical science, and the works of social scientists cease to be monographs unconnected with one another and lacking cognitive value. Durkheim extended his plan of 'sociologisation' to the theory of knowledge and logic, and also to the non-philosophical sciences (history, ethnography, economics, etc.). Philosophy, too, was subject to reconstruction on the basis of sociology and its data.[8]

In Durkheim's understanding the relation of sociology and philosophy was expressed in a contradictory formula: on the one hand, a requirement of separating sociology from philosophy; on the other, a search for new forms of the links between them. He considered that sociology, when hived off from philosophy, got a chance to concern itself with its own problems, viz., social reality as such. What he had in mind was its separation from traditional idealistic metaphysics far removed from understanding the reality. One of the end results of the

development of social research was, in his view, the creation of a sociologically substantiated philosophy, since a really scientific answer to the most difficult metaphysical problems (on the nature of morality, religion, etc.) was only possible, as he considered, on the basis of sociological studies. The tasks that had previously been unsuccessfully tackled from an objective-idealist (theological) or subjective-idealist (psychological) positions were resolvable by sociology when the explanation of essentially social phenomena was given an empirical basis. The sociological point of view should thus alter philosophy and rid it of its speculative character. That posing of the problem of the relation of sociology and philosophy, and of sociology's place among other social sciences, was not encountered in any non-Marxian school of sociology, and contained several true ideas. But, having posed the problem of the unity of the sciences and of a synthesis of their results, Durkheim could neither satisfactorily conceptualise them nor, furthermore, cope with the tasks that stemmed in practice from his conception.

3. 'Sociologism' as a Theory of Society

Two main tendencies can be traced in Durkheim's theoretical conceptions. The first of them, naturalism, stemmed from an understanding of society and its laws and patterns on the analogy of nature and its natural laws, and was linked with the traditions of the philosophy of the French Enlightenment. The second trend, 'social realism', was a conception of society as a reality of a special kind (*sui generis*), distinct from all other forms of reality (physical, chemical, biological, psychological). It was linked with the conceptions of society developed by the traditionalists (Bonald, de Maistre) and by Saint-Simon and Comte.

Social realism, as a theory of society, is a part of Durkheim's 'sociologism'.[9]

On the theoretical plane 'sociologism', in contrast to individualist conceptions, affirmed the principle of the specific nature and autonomy of social reality and, furthermore, of its primacy and superiority over individuals. By comparison with the individual society was treated as a reality richer in content. On the methodological plane the following were characteristic of 'so-

ciologism': the principle of an objective scientific approach to social phenomena; the requirement of explanation of the social by other social phenomena and, in that connection, the need of a critique of biological and psychological reductionism.

'Sociologism' was directly connected with the answer to the basic philosophical question. Durkheim recognised the connection of mind and matter and pointed out the origin of social consciousness from the 'social milieu'. Because social life, he wrote,

> is partly independent of the organism, however, it does not follow that it depends upon no natural cause, and that it must be put outside nature. But all these facts whose explanations we cannot find in the constitution of tissues derive from properties of the social milieu.[10]

The nub of his conception was a striving to include moral and religious phenomena in the sphere of natural ones that had 'conditions and causes' but at the same time retain their specific character. That led to assigning qualities to the public mind, or social consciousness, of a kind that converted it into an almost independent phenomenon generating social life as such.

Durkheim drew a sharp line between individual and collective consciousness. The group, he wrote, thought, felt, and acted quite differently than its members would if they were isolated; if one started with the latter, one would not be able to understand what was happening in the group.[11] He called collective or general consciousness a psychic type of society with its own mode of development, not reducible to a material basis, its own properties and its own conditions of existence. In trying to express the dynamic aspect of the collective mind and its spontaneous, unregulatable character, Durkheim introduced 'collective idea' to designate emotionally coloured ideas and beliefs; in their origin, and by their content, they were social, collective.

When Durkheim was examining the genesis of collective, general consciousness, he based himself on the idea of the continuous development of nature and the 'creative synthesis' of the simple and complex.

He interpreted the relations of the individuals in society as

ones of association, as a result of which a new quality arose—social life as a process of activity.

The theory that a new quality, social life, arose during the intercourse and association of individuals from the facts of interaction and communication has been called 'associationist realism' in many studies of Durkheim.[12]

Rejecting belief in society as a transcendental hypostasised and substantial whole, and warning against such an interpretation of his conception, Durkheim wrote that a belief or a social practice was capable of existing independently of its individual expressions. He would obviously, therefore, not dream of saying that society was possible without individuals, which is manifestly absurd.[13] By the 'independence of society' Durkheim meant only its objectivity in relation to the individual, and its special, qualitative, specific nature, and not othersidedness or supernaturalness. In using this expression, Durkheim did not of course mean to hypostatise collective consciousness. He did not recognise a more substantial soul in society than in the individual.[14] He interpreted the relation of society and the individual as a relation of the whole and its parts, constantly citing a chemical whole (as a synthesis of its component elements) as an example.

However, along with the associationist aspect, there is another, not unimportant side to Durkheim's conception of society. When pointing out the earthly, social roots of religion, he called God society. He wanted, by employing the concepts of God and society as synonyms, to suggest new ideas corresponding to the criteria of rationality and secularism instead of decayed religious notions. When stressing the sanctity of society and attributing features of spirituality and hyperspirituality to it, he wanted to express the idea of its moral superiority to individuals.

But, by attributing features of sanctity to society, he thereby painted it in traditional religious colours. His naturalism and rationalism were not only fully combined with a religious-spiritualist terminology but also with an idealist interpretation of social life.

Durkheim's views on society evolved. In his early works he insisted on a close relationship between collective consciousness and the social milieu. Accordingly, as the size of groups, the density and mobility of their individual components, and

the relation between individual minds and the collective mind changed the general beliefs sanctioned by the latter, also altered. Later he began to consider collective consciousness a vital nexus of society as a whole.

Society, he declared, was an 'ensemble of ideas, beliefs, and sentiments of all kinds that were realised by individuals'.[15]

Historical idealism (of which this definition of society is a clear formulation) led Durkheim almost always to interpret social relations as moral ones; and he called ideals the 'spirit of society' and its essence.

Durkheim's pupil Célestin Bouglé justly pointed out that there was no monism in positivism, especially in Durkheim's positivism.[16] Durkheim regarded society and its consciousness as single-plane phenomena; in his conception they were not only interconnected and mutually conditioned, but could also alter the etymological sequence during explanation. Now collective ideas were the product of society, and now society, on the contrary, was a product of collective ideas—this did not phase Durkheim; on the contrary, it seemed an attribute of scientific character to him. And as Bouglé has remarked, there one met 'a central point of Durkheim's philosophy'.[17]

4. The Rules of Sociological Method

The methodology of sociological research that Durkheim developed helped make him a leading spokesman of positivism.

In setting himself the task of establishing sociology theoretically and methodologically, he tried to tie its methodological principles up closely with his conception of its subject-matter as facts of a special kind, i.e., social. In that he continued the traditions of positivism, in the sense that he systematically examined the rules of the gathering of initial empirical data, of examining the relations empirically established between them and the evidence for hypotheses put forward. He shared the naturalistic principles of positivists, striving to build sociology on the example of the natural sciences with the inductive methods and principles of objective observation characteristic of them. His main opponent on these matters was psychologism, in particular the method of introspection typical of the time.

The first rule, which in Durkheim's view should be to ensure an objective approach to social reality, was to consider social facts as things.[18]

To treat social phenomena as 'things' meant to recognise their existence independent of the subject and to study them objectively in the way a natural science studied its subject-matter. In applying the principles of methodological objectivism to the study of collective ideas, whose nature was ideal, 'hyperspiritualistic', Durkheim ran into several very complicated questions. Since collective states of consciousness could not be observed directly, they could only, he claimed, be judged indirectly from the objective facts about various forms of behaviour and according to the expression of collective consciousness in the form of social institutions. Sociology thus dealt with the objectivisation of social consciousness and with its expression in objective indicators. Durkheim considered, for example, that the figures of statistics helped bring out 'trends' of everyday life inaccessible in any other way, that the proverbs of primitive peoples brought out their customs, and that works of art disclosed historically changing tastes, etc.[19]

Since it was possible to apply the method of indirect observation in the physical sciences, it was also possible to do so in sociology. But the aim of science did not boil down, according to Durkheim, to a description and ordering of social facts by means of observed objective indicators. They helped establish deeper causal connections and laws. The existence of a law in the social world was evidence of the scientific character of sociology (which brought out this law), and of its affinity to the other sciences. It was laws that formed the subject-matter of the social science's research, Durkheim considered, and he linked the concept of law closely with the principle of determinism. He regarded fact and law as correlative categories that reflected various levels of the links of reality. A fact was an external manifestation of a law; a law was the general inner basis of a fact.

While trying to achieve as great objectivity as possible in the gathering of empirical material, Durkheim stressed that it was necessary, in the first phase of an investigation, to take as the initial facts only those phenomena that could be directly observed.

He saw in his requirement of starting from sensations, and borrowing elements of their initial definitions[20] from sense data, a guarantee of avoiding preconceptions or vulgar notions and phantoms that distorted the true aspect of things, and that were taken for the things themselves.[21] In continuing the battle against these 'phantoms' begun by Francis Bacon, Durkheim demanded that confused, vague ideas, prejudices, and emotions be banished from science.

Facts, he claimed, should be classified independently of the scholar and of the waverings of his mind, and be based on the nature of the things. Hence his requirement to give objective definitions of concepts by distinguishing the features common for a whole class of phenomena.

Durkheim was aware of the need of a theoretical definition of scientific concepts, and demanded that they meet the criterion of unity and not be based just on one isolated fact. But his clearly expressed predilection for inductivism and empiricism did not help him analyse the modes of formation of theoretical scientific concepts more fully, and to show how their connections with scientific theory were manifested.

His desire to find the objective patterns of social phenomena determined the high value he put on the application of statistics in sociology. Statistical patterns of marriages, variations in the birth rate, of the number of suicides, and much else that wholly depended, at first glance, on individual causes, seemed to him to be the best evidence that these patterns manifested some collective state.

Durkheim considered theoretical substantiation of the possibility of a scientific explanation of social facts to be one of the most important problems; in tackling it, he differentiated two kinds of analysis, causal and functional, and applied that in sociological research.

A sociological explanation, according to him, was a causal one, the essence of which was analysis of the dependence of a social phenomenon on the social milieu. He criticised all other attempts to explain social life from that angle, viz. Mill's psychological reductionism, Comte's explanation of social evolution as the consequence of man's inherent drive to develop his own nature, and utilitarian theories, especially the Spencerian conception.

Durkheim borrowed the concept of function from biology; it meant that there was a relation of correspondence between a given physiological process and some need of the organism as a whole. Translating this thesis into social terms, he claimed that the function of a social phenomenon or institution was to adjust the correspondence between an institution and a certain need of society as a whole, for example, to 'ask what the function of the division of labor is, is to seek for the need which it supplies'.[22]

His interpretation of function as an objective connection between a phenomenon and a certain state of society as a whole was quite justified. A function thus depended not only on the objective features of the phenomenon performing it but also expressed the idea of connection or relation.

Durkheim did not succeed in developing the method of functional analysis to the end, however, since he experienced great theoretical difficulties in a number of cases. He could not, for example, put forward and substantiate a theoretical criterion of the truth of the conception of social phenomenon, although he repeatedly pointed out mistakes in the vulgar interpretation of some social institution and its function.

Durkheim considered that only one of the rules for establishing causes developed by Mill was applicable to sociology, viz., the method of concomitant changes. If it was established that two types of phenomena were constantly in one and the same relations and constantly changed, as it were, in parallel, there were grounds for suggesting that there was a causal link between them. But he suggested that a constancy of connections between phenomena was not sufficient in order to ascertain a causal dependence, since there were links that could be very stable but were not causal. Correlations like that were formed through both types of interconnected phenomena being the consequence of some common cause not involved in the correlation.

Durkheim endeavoured to study how reliable knowledge of a cause could be obtained, and how a causal relation could be demonstrated. If it was impossible, when studying phenomena in one society, to define their cause reliably, by singling it out from a host of other causes and analysing its action separately, this might be done by studying similar phenomena in other

societies in which the operative factors could be observed partially isolated.

Durkheim attached much more importance to comparative research than Comte did. He claimed that it helped decide all the principal theoretical tasks of sociology since only by comparing one and the same phenomena in different societies could the general and the specific in them be discovered that determined their diversity and their development in different directions. For those considerations he included causal analysis in the comparative method of research. After a relationship had been established between two social phenomena it was necessary to clarify their importance and distribution by means of a comparative study, and to define whether they occurred in different social conditions or only in a certain society, or in a certain common state of different societies.

The striving to avoid descriptiveness and to develop a theory and methodology of sociological explanation were very positive elements of 'sociologism', just like its methodological objectivism and orientation on the natural sciences.

Durkheim's structural-functional analysis was based on an analogy between society and an organism as a highly perfected system of organs and functions. From the analogies with an organism he deduced the concept of a normal type of society, concepts of a norm and pathology that he later employed to interpret such phenomena as crime, crisis, and other forms of social disorganisation.

Those social functions that stemmed from the conditions of a social organism's existence were normal, according to him. Crime and other social ailments, although harming society and causing repugnance, were normal in the sense that they were rooted in certain social conditions and supported useful, necessary social relations.

The external, directly perceptible objective sign that made it possible to distinguish the two sorts of factors (normal and pathological) from one another, was (in Durkheim's view) the degree of their universality or commonness. Generality was an indication of social health.[23] A social fact, he wrote, was normal for a certain social type considered as a definite phase of its development, when it was produced in the average of societies of that kind considered at the corresponding phase of their evolution.[24]

The conception of the normal as a generality and the common led Durkheim not only to paradoxical conclusions but also to relativism. He treated crime, for instance, which is met in all or most societies, as a normal phenomenon. On the contrary, however, he qualified such typical social phenomena as the increase in the number of suicides at the end of the nineteenth century, and certain types of economic crisis, as pathological.[25]

Durkheim had a feeling of a need to base himself on a definite theory of society and historical development when speaking of some ideal, optimum form of society in relation to which deviant cases had to be regarded. But he could not substantiate this form theoretically, which inevitably led him to relativism in his appreciation of any social phenomenon.

Relativism could be avoided in the evaluation of various social phenomena by passing to the soil of objective criteria of historical progress and by treating subjective criteria in accordance with a general theory of the progressive development of society. But, while rejecting the ideas of the evolutionists about direct, linear development, Durkheim did not work out his own consistent theoretical conception of history. Unlike the later structural functionalists, who often avoided comparing the requirements of the structural-functional approach and historical (causal) analysis, he recognised both approaches as legitimate. But his treatment of society as a harmonious unity complicated his understanding of the causes and driving forces of development; the problem of them was unresolvable in principle from a stance that made the social whole an absolute. The historical method that Durkheim proposed to employ in research made it a requirement to study the social environment as the main source of changes and did not clarify the sense of the concept itself in regard to history.

The development of causal and functional analysis in regard to society was a fruitful and promising line. It was important that Durkheim defended social determinism at a time when a tendency had grown up in social studies to interpret the principle of causality in a subjectivist spirit.

Durkheim's orientation on comparative analysis as a necessary requirement of sociological research was also very fruitful. This research, in fact, often lacks scientific sense and meaning when it has no historical perspective enabling it to compare

social phenomena in different societies and in various temporal parameters. Characteristically, this requirement was forgotten by the later structural functionalists.

One can conclude on the whole that Durkheim's sociological method has retained its significance to the present in that part of it concerned with the main postulates of research. But their realisation was limited and hampered subsequently by the inadequate theoretical basis of 'sociologism'.

5. Social Solidarity and the Division of Labour

The central problem of Durkheim's work was social solidarity. Its solution would have provided an answer to what links united people in society. It was necessary to determine the nature and function of social solidarity in modern 'developed' society in contrast to primitive or traditional ones and to explain the historical transition from one form of society to another.

Durkheim criticised the main sociological conceptions of the factors uniting people in society. These factors could not be the free play of individual interests (Spencer) or the state (Comte, Tönnies). The force that created the social whole and promoted its preservation in spite of centrifugal tendencies was the division of labour. His main thesis was that the division of labour, by which he understood professional or vocational specialisation, more and more performed the role that the common consciousness sometimes did; it held social aggregates of the highest types together in the main.[26]

Durkheim set himself the following tasks: (1) 'to determine the function of the division of labor, that is to say, what social need it satisfies'; (2) 'to determine, then, the causes and conditions on which it is dependent'; (3) 'to classify the principal abnormal forms' since, in his opinion, in them 'as in biology, pathology will help us more fully to understand physiology'.[27]

Division of labour was a sign of a highly developed society. As a consequence of an ever increasing specialisation of work individuals were compelled to exchange their activity, to perform mutually supplementing functions unwittingly constituting a single whole. Solidarity in a developed society was a natural consequence of the division of production roles. How, then, did

matters stand in archaic societies in which there was no division of labour?

Starting from the ideas, typical of nineteenth-century sociology, of the construction of two types of society between which there was a historial continuity,[28] Durkheim built a dichotomy of societies with mechanical and organic solidarity as two links in a single evolutionary chain.

He called the solidarity that prevailed in undeveloped, archaic societies mechanical, on the analogy of the connection that existed between the molecules of inorganic substances (the molecules all alike and connected in a purely mechanical way). Solidarity in such societies was determined by the similarity and likeness of the individuals comprising them, by the sameness of the social functions performed by these individuals, and by the undeveloped nature of individual features. Mechanical solidarity was possible through the absorption of individuality by the collective.

Durkheim found an objective indicator, a 'visible symbol' of solidarity in law. Repressive law in which the force of the collective consciousness was expressed was characteristic of mechanical solidarity; its task was to punish the individual strictly who infringed custom or law.

He established a functional dependence between the strength of the social ties characteristic of one type of solidarity or the other, on the one hand, and the relative size (scope) of the collective consciousness and its intensity and more or less definiteness, on the other.

Solidarity was stronger if the scope of collective consciousness coincided with that of individual consciousnesses, and if the collective consciousness was more intensive and more clearly expressed. There was then no place for individual deviations and the collective consciousness regulated the whole life of the individual without a remainder, and collective authority was absolute.

In such cases the collective consciousness was wholly and completely religious in its content. Anticipating his future theory of religion Durkheim put forward a thesis that where a group of people shared a strong conviction it inevitably took on a religious character. The main feature of religious beliefs and feelings was that they were 'common to a certain number of people living together, and that, besides they have an average intensity that is quite heightened'.[29] He thus identified the so-

cial and the religious: 'everything social is religious; the two words are synonyms'.[30]

But religion, he said, embraced an ever diminishing part of social life. Development of the division of labour, in which an increasing number of the most varied functions was displayed, was the principal, direct factor weakening the single collective consciousness. Once people began to perform private special functions in society, there was a weakening of social consciousness which was functionally differentiated so as to correspond to the ever increasing division of labour and more complex social organisation.

A developed society in which each individual performed some one special function in accordance with the division of social labour resembled an organism with its various organs; Durkheim therefore called the new type of solidarity organic. The division of labour determined the differences of individuals, who developed individual, personal capacities and talents in accordance with their professional or vocational role. Each individual was now a personality. Consciousness that each depended on the other, that all were connected by a single system of social relations created by the division of labour, evoked a feeling of dependence on one another, of solidarity, and of one's link with society. And, 'since the division of labor becomes the chief source of social solidarity, it becomes, at the same time, the foundation of the moral order'.[31]

Organic solidarity corresponded to so-called restitutive law, whose function was to review 'the past in order to reinstate it, as far as possible, to its normal form'.[32]

Given organic solidarity, collective consciousness acquired new forms and changed its content. It became smaller in scope, and only a very narrow part of developed societies; its intensity and degree of determinacy were also reduced. 'The role of collective conscience becomes small as labor is divided.'[33]

Collective consciousness was more and more converted, as regards its content, into a secular, rationalist one, oriented to the individual. At the same time Durkheim denied that 'the common conscience is threatened with total extinction'.[34] 'We erect a cult in behalf of personal dignity,' he wrote, 'which, as every strong cult, already has its superstitions. It is thus, if one wishes, a common cult'.[35]

1147

Durkheim stressed and distinguished an aspect of solidarity in the division of labour in modern society, pushing the problem of the antagonism of labour and capital, the 'forced character' of labour, and the moral and economic crises of society into the background. When he analysed these matters at the end of *The Division of Labor,* he was inclined to treat them as the result of inadequate regulation of the relations between the main classes, and as an unwholesome element in the life of society, which he regarded as a united society on the whole that retained the unity and wholeness of preceding epochs. According to him the division of labour was exactly the mechanism that, in modern society (which had largely lost the cementing force of the general, religious consciousness), created the desired social ties and class solidarity that allegedly compensated for all the shortcomings associated with narrow specialisation. The concept of solidarity thus became the axis around which the whole analysis of the division of labour and definition of its functions turned.

Durkheim's main thesis, that the division of labour naturally generated solidarity, stemmed from his defining it not in relation to some class or other of a certain socio-economic system, but only in respect of collective or general consciousness.

He regarded solidarity as the highest moral principle, the supreme value, allegedly universal and recognised by all members of society. Since the need for public order, harmony, and solidarity was counted as moral by everyone, the division of labour itself was also moral. Durkheim's conception thus served to define the conditions of the maintenance of society; that was the chief task he set sociological science. The generality of the recognition of social solidarity as the highest value was only postulated, of course, and not proved.

Durkheim considered the cause of the division of labour to be growth of population, which governed the intensity of social life. An increase in 'physical density' and in the 'size' of societies was inextricably linked, in his view, with an increase in 'moral or dynamic density', i.e., in the level of social interaction, which led in the end to division of labour.

But how? The struggle for existence increased with growth of population; in those conditions division of labour was the sole means of preserving and maintaining a given society, of creating social solidarity of a new type, and of giving society

the chance to develop in a progressive direction.

According to Durkheim the causal relation was neither simple nor linear, but included a host of variables; the causal explanation of social facts should not completely ignore the value aspect of social life, although it could not be based entirely on it. The fact that he insisted on a postulate to explain the social by the social, did not allow him to go beyond stating an interaction between factors and to establish the true causal dependence of phenomena. That could only be done through a deeper analysis, since only an approach to society as the interaction of different aspects of a single socio-economic formation made it possible to bring out the dependence between them as one between a determinant cause and derivative consequences.

Durkheim, of course, started from the philosophical principle that phenomena of one level do not arise from phenomena of another. That orientation ruled out in principle the possibility, when explaining social phenomena, of appealing to phenomena of another, higher order, to more fundamental phenomena, i.e., to the economic relations of society. He therefore failed to give a properly causal explanation of the division of labour. He only touched on the interaction of the different factors within the limits of the social sphere, without rising to the level at which the true causes of the division of labour could only be found. These had to be sought first of all in the conditions of the economic affairs of class society, and in the concrete character of its relations of production, which determined the division of labour. Durkheim denied the firmness and stability of economic ties, and their capability of creating society, determining its character, and ensuring duration of existence. He therefore did not study the division of labour (which he identified with growth of specialisation) from the economic angle, but from a moral standpoint, considering it the principal factor creating social solidarity, i.e., society.

6. 'Abnormal' Forms of the Division of Labour. Personality and Society

Durkheim was a witness of the mounting crisis phenomena in both the economic and spiritual affairs of society. He called the

growth of contradictions between labour and capital and the anarchy of production 'abnormal' forms of the division of labour caused by too high rates of social development. In the third part of *The Division of Labor,* devoted to investigation of these 'abnormal' forms, he distinguished the following 'pathological forms' of capitalism: anomy, social inequality, and inadequate organisation of the division of labour. He sought an explanation of anomy, i.e., the social state in which there was an absence of clear-cut moral regulation of individuals' behaviour, in lack of development of rules governing relations between social functions that are not adapted to one another.[36] That was displayed particularly clearly during an economic or trade crisis in the antagonism of labour and capital. With growth of the market economy production was becoming uncontrollable and unregulatable. With the development of large-scale industry relations between employers and workers were changing. On the one hand, the needs of the latter were increasing; on the other, machines were more and more replacing people. 'The worker is regimented, separated from his family throughout the day'.[37] And, 'as these changes have been accomplished with extreme rapidity, the interests in conflict have not yet had the time to be equilibrated'.[38] Growth of large-scale industry was breaking up the unity of the small enterprise, creating two big classes, capital and labour, which were antagonistically related (Durkheim did not deny that).

For him the normal state of society should be characterised by a development of economic planning and normative regulation of economic relations through production corporations. In that case he identified the normal with the optimum and best.

The ailments of capitalism Durkheim described (such as unregulated competition, unrestrained by anything; class conflict; monotony of work and degradation of labour power) he characterised as the pains of too rapid growth of production and division of labour, and as temporary side-effects of natural evolution.

He also considered inequality, which entailed deviation from organic solidarity, an 'abnormal form' of the division of labour. Any 'outward inequality', created, for example, by the inheritance of property, menaced organic solidarity, so that the latter was only possible given elimination of inequality and attainment

of justice through 'the distribution of natural talents'.[39]

Equality of opportunities, he claimed, was prevented by the class system, which deprived the broad masses of the chance to occupy a social position in accordance with their capabilities. That led to an unjust exchange of services.

> If one class of society is obliged, in order to live, to take any price for its services, while another can abstain from such action thanks to resources at its disposal which, however, are not necessarily due to any social superiority, the second has an unjust advantage over the first at law.[40]

(Durkheim had in mind superiority of capabilities—*E.O.*).

Durkheim thought that 'abnormal' forms of the division of labour could be overcome by peaceful settlement of conflicts, reducing struggle and competition to an acceptable scale, establishing a code of rules rigorously regulating the relations of classes, and the introduction of justice and equality in the external conditions, i.e., equality of social opportunities and remuneration of all according to their services.

He did not imagine a society in which private property and inequality of all kinds would be fully abolished. He considered they would exist, although the relation between them would change. Access to material goods would be regulated by individuals' natural capacities and talents.

The last of the 'abnormal' forms of the division of labour pointed out by Durkheim arose when the worker's professional activity was insufficient because of lack of co-ordination of actions.

Solidarity of social organisation grew, in his view, when labour was more intense and organised. That utopian thesis was refuted, however, by the course of the development of capitalist production in the twentieth century. Neither 'scientific organisation of work' nor any of the other ways of intensifying it have led to class solidarity of antagonistic society. Durkheim's concept of the division of labour itself was different from Marx's. The source of class conflict needs to be sought in the division of labour between the classes of society in accordance with their relation to the means of production, as Marx suggested, rather than through its analysis as specialisation of professional func-

tions. Whether ownership of the means of production is inherited or newly acquired is a secondary matter; the main thing is that property relations determine all the other relations of capitalist society and underlie the antagonism of labour and capital.

The ways that Durkheim outlined for overcoming the defects of capitalism were unreal and utopian, though he counted less and less on natural development of solidarity through the division of labour itself, and more and more sharply raised the question of curing capitalism's ulcers, first by posing the task or reorganising society within the limits of the capitalist system and then relying on moral education in the spirit of the corresponding values and ideals.

Durkheim's answer to the broader, sociological problem of the relation of society and the individual was also based on an analysis of the contradictions of capitalism. His view was that society could not develop and flourish if the human personality was oppressed, if a person performing a narrow vocational function was reduced to the level of a machine. Furthermore, the individual would inevitably be degraded if the economic and social functions of society were threatened. In that case he avoided the typical dichotomy of the nineteenth century expressed in posing the question of the relationship of the individual and society in such a way as necessarily to recognise the priority of one of its aspects. The individual and society, he considered, were in relations of mutual dependence, each being interested in the development and prosperity of the other. The happiness and well-being of the individual, he suggested, depended on the state of society; and all the more so when social affairs were more regulated and consequently when the individual's rights and freedoms were guaranteed.

Durkheim took on the role of a denouncer of the inevitable moral evil arising from the specialisation and differentiation of industry. When a worker 'every day ... repeats the same movements with monotonous regularity, but without being interested in them, and without understanding them',[41] he is converted into an inert wheel driven by an external force.

In Durkheim's view the conversion of a person into an appendage of the machine could not be moderated or smoothed over by granting workers universal education, or developing an interest in art or literature in them, because familiarisation with

culture would make the narrow limits of their specialisation even more intolerable.

How, then, to eliminate the contradiction between the division of labour, which was being increased by the specialisation of the worker's function, and the needs of the development of his personality and individuality? The division of labour, according to Durkheim, did not in itself entail negative consequences; they arose only in exceptional, abnormal circumstances. Therefore 'it is necessary and it is sufficient for it to be itself, for nothing to come from without to denature it'.[42] That was possible when workers' consciousness of the goal, of solidarity with others, and of the social need of their labour gave it a special content, made it not only tolerable but even desirable. An important condition of workers' joint, agreed activity was that the functions they fulfilled should correspond to their capabilities and inclinations. When the accord between individuals' capabilities and the kind of activity assigned to them was broken, society became sick.

While explaining the origin of social crises so naively, Durkheim insisted at the same time that 'differences which originally separated these classes must have disappeared or grown less'.[43] The differentiation of society should rest on advantages that were due to the individual capabilities of everyone, and not on social privileges.

Equality, justice, and freedom were thus, in his views, the basis of a social system of the highest type of organisation, to which modern industrial society approximated. So, in the period of the crisis of capitalism and of the wide spread of socialist ideology, he was again repeating old capitalist slogans.

Society consists of moral ties, conscious striving for an ideal, and moral relations that can and should be consciously regulated—such were the cornerstones of Durkheimian reformism. In affirming that 'this work of justice will become ever more complete as the organised type develops',[44] i.e., in developed capitalist society, he apologetically ascribed socialist features to it. He considered it truly possible to consciously control social processes. Hence his practical recommendations

> to suppress useless tasks to distribute work in such a way that each one will be sufficiently occupied, and consequently, to increase the

functional activity of each worker. Thus, order will be achieved at the same time that work is more economically managed.[45]

Durkheim's answer to the problem of the relation of the individual and society was distinguished by his not idealising the past and seeing the sources and possibilities of the development of individuality in progressive development of the division of labour. While the individual's 'liberty is only apparent and his personality borrowed'[46] in the initial stages of organisation, he gets the chance in a higher stage to become harmonious and whole by freely developing his/her capabilities. Development of the personality 'in depth' connected with narrow specialisation was no less important than the development 'in breadth' that bordered on diletantism. A person acquired, through association with other people, what he lost through narrow specialisation. While not noting the exploiter character of work that caused alienation of the individual, and while linking the difficulties experienced by the specialised worker only with temporary, unfavourable conditions, Durkheim believed that the general ideals of fraternity and solidarity and awareness of the common goal of all workers compensated their inevitable losses.

His aim was to improve capitalist society and not to reconstruct it radically. In spite of elements of a new approach to separate social phenomena, he therefore did not go beyond Comte, concentrating attention on moral problems and improving the legal and moral regulation of social relations.

7. Application of the Principles of 'Sociologism' to Study of the Causes of Suicide

The problem of suicide, to study of which Durkheim devoted a special monograph, attracted his attention for many reasons. There was a clearly circumscribed group of facts that could be easily defined.[47] Instead of abandoning himself to metaphysical speculation about social phenomena, the sociologist could find true laws that would reveal the possibilities of sociology better than any dialectical argumentation.[48] That was the first point. Secondly, Durkheim regarded it his work to apply the main principle of sociological method to empirical material: viz.,

study of a social fact as a 'thing', i.e., recognition of the existence of a special reality external to the individual, a social reality that, while determining his behaviour, did not depend on his will.

While basing himself on these theoretical, methodological premisses, Durkheim rejected explanation of suicide by individual, psychological motives, and claimed that social causes alone were the explanatory factors. Suicide depended mainly on the external causes that governed people and not on the individual's inner properties.

In bringing out the features of social crisis, Durkheim noted that suicide was one of the forms that society's collective ailment took and that this was why it would help us to understand the ailment. Determination of the causes of social illness, and recommendations for overcoming it, seemed to him the best means of consolidating the standing of sociology as a science. A sociological explanation of the most individual action could throw light on the forces that unite people, since suicide was a clear example of disruption of social connections.

'Sociologism' was the essence of his explanation; all other factors were regarded through its prism, including the individual predisposition to suicide. In showing that the psychological motives of suicides, which often seemed their causes, were only an individual, and moreover distorted reflection of general conditions, Durkheim turned to study of the social milieu as the main cause influencing a change in the percentage of suicides. He did not completely reject the role of individual factors and the psychic state and specific life circumstances of individual suicides, but he stressed their secondary significance and their dependence on general social causes and the state of society.

The percentage of suicides (the ratio of the number of suicides to the total population), in the conception advanced by Durkheim, was a function of several social variables: the relationship in religious, family, political, national, and other groups. Starting from that he employed a technique of proof by elimination (exclusion): he systematically examined and rejected such non-social facts as the 'psycho-organic predisposition' of individuals (psychopatic state, racial and inherited factors), features of the physical environment (climate, season, time of day) and the processes of imitation. After that he examined the

effect of social causes and the way in which they operated, and also the relations of the social and non-social factors.

Drawing on the official statistics, he discovered a number of partial patterns: the percentage of suicides was higher in summer than in winter; men committed suicide more often than women, old people more often than the young, soldiers more often than the civil population, Protestants more often than Catholics, the single and widowed more often that the married; the percentage of suicides was higher in urban areas than in rural ones, and so on. Leaving aside the individual qua individual, and his incentives and ideas, he said, one had to ask immediately what were the states of the different social milieux (religious, family, political society, professional groups, etc.), as a function of which suicide varied.[49] When studying the social factors, Durkheim tried to determine which one, or what element of it, was most closely linked with the percentage of suicides, in accordance with the various logical rules, especially the rule of attendant changes. What feature of religion, for example, had the highest correlation with suicide? What was it about Catholicism that made Catholics less prone to suicide than Protestants?

Having begun with investigation of how some creed influenced suicide, Durkheim showed the difference between Catholicism and Protestantism from the angle both of dogma and of rituals. Catholicism, as the older traditional system of beliefs and rituals, had a much greater unity, strength of convictions, and irreconcilability toward innovations that disturb the general spirit, than Protestantism. That conditioned the greater cohesion and solidarity of a religious group of Catholics, and hence, consequently, the lower percentage of suicides among them. Protestantism was associated with a decline of traditional beliefs and permeated with a spirit of freethinking and criticism. Its possibility of uniting believers was less and the percentage of suicides therefore higher.

This hypothesis helped explain many other social variables connected with growth of the number of suicides. These variables were united by the degree of the individual's social integration or social ties. Family, children, rural life were socially integrating factors that kept the individual from feeling socially isolated. Suicide, he suggested, varied inversely with the degree of integration of the social groups the individual belonged to.[50]

Factors of a non-social order could only affect the percentage of suicides indirectly. Durkheim employed a procedure in which the non-social factor was included in the relation but found that aspect of it that was most closely linked with a social factor. The influence of biological, for example sex, differences, became understandable when the relative social positions of men and women, their ways of taking part in social and economic affairs, the changing cycle of their social activity, etc., were analysed. When asserting that different types of suicide could stem from different determinant causes,[51] and pointing out the difficulty of compiling a morphological classification of suicides that allowed for their characteristic types of peculiarity, Durkheim decided to compare an aetiological classification corresponding to the causes of suicides.

Durkheim distinguished four types of suicide: egoistic, altruistic, anomic, and fatalistic. The first was caused by reasons leading to the individual's alienation from society which ceased to exert a regulating effect on him. Rupture of social ties, absence of collective support, and a state of estrangement and isolation caused a feeling of loneliness and emptiness, a sensation of the tragedy of existence. Extreme individualism could be a cause of suicides of that kind, but the soil generating it was a sick society, 'a kind of collective athenia', and 'social malaise'.[52] Social disorganisation and loss of social aims weakened the ties binding the individual to society and consequently to life. That general state was reflected in turn in a disintegration of the social groups, religious, family or political, that directly affected the individual.

The second type of suicide, the altruistic, was encountered when personal interests were quite submerged by social ones, and when the integration of the group was so great that the individual ceased to exist as an independent entity. Durkheim included ancient customs in this, viz., suicide of the old and sick, wives' self-cremation after the death of husbands, the suicide of slaves after their owner's death, etc. Suicide of that sort existed mainly in archaic societies.

The third type of suicide, the anomic, was encountered mainly during great social upheavals and economic crises, when the individual lost the capacity to adjust to social changes and new social requirements, and lost his/her links with society. The

state of social anomy, by which Durkheim meant absence of any rules and standards of behaviour, when the old hierarchy of values had broken down and a new one had not taken shape, engendered moral instability of separate individuals. When the social structure tottered and was disorganised, some individuals rose rapidly, while others lost their position in society; and when social equilibrium was disturbed the number of suicides increased. Durkheim characterised anomic suicide, which was most often met in business circles, also from the angle of the individual qualities of members of the commercial and industrial world, and of their unbridled drive for gain which, not meeting stiff regulation, grew excessively, disrupting moral and psychic balance. A weakening or absence of social regulation, and disordered, unregulated human activity underlay anomic suicide. When society was incapable of exerting the necessary influence on a person, a lamentable outcome was inevitable.

The opposite of anomic suicide was fatalistic, which arose as a result of increased control over the individual by the group, when there was an excess of strict regulation, which became intolerable to the individual. It was committed by subjects whose futures were relentlessly walled in, and whose passions were violently checked by an oppressive discipline.[53]

Suicide was thus, in his view, a deliberate, conscious act committed by an individual, depending on the social discipline. The measure of normal social behaviour was the normal social subject who respected the rule and was amenable to collective authority.[54]

The concepts 'egoism–altruism' and 'anomy–fatalism' signified, in Durkheim's conceptions, the collective force or propensity that drove a person to suicide. He called these 'forces' tendencies. Their intensity could be measured by the rate of suicides. Collective forces or propensities could explain, according to him, individual inclinations and predispositions to suicide and not the other way round. The psychological motives of suicide were individual, and often, moreover, distorted reflections of the general conditions of the social milieu.

The most valuable feature of his analysis was his revealing that the social essence of suicide was caused by crisis states of capitalist society. His ideas gave a push to sociological studies of 'deviant behaviour' as employed and developed, in particular,

by Robert Merton. But, having clearly defined the state of moral demoralisation, moral and psychic disorganisation, and decay of capitalist society, Durkheim did not bring out the true reasons for this crisis, seeing in it too high rates of social change with which the moral consciousness could not keep up, rather than the essence of capitalist relations.[55]

The idea of a way out from the crisis through the creation of production corporations to consolidate the moral order of society was utopian.

One must also point out the abstract, formalistic character of Durkheim's typology of suicide. The essence of this social phenomenon became distorted by his including various acts that reflected the social standards of different socio-economic formations in one group.

While paying principal attention to the social factor, Durkheim limited himself solely to pointing out its link with the psychological factor. The idea that the individual's decision was determined by cultural requirements and standards, and by an orientation in regard to human life and its value, was only expressed by Durkheim but not developed.

Despite the fact that his conceptions needed a more detailed analysis of the relation of objective and subjective factors, the main trend of his study gave an impulse to development of the general question of the social conditioning of individual psychology.[56]

Durkheim paved the way for quantitative analysis in sociology and blazed the way to develop its particular methods and techniques (such as, for example, the method of successive inclusion of factors involved in interaction, the essence of which lay in study and interpretation of the complex of relationships between the numerous characteristics systematically included in the relation studied earlier, study of this relation in widely varying contexts, etc.). Durkheim was not able to use such instruments of scientific analysis as the correlation coefficient, the concept of statistical interaction, the formalisation of analytical procedures, etc., that are elementary from today's standpoint. In spite of that his work played a significant role in establishing the sociological approach to suicide in contrast to the psychopathological approach popular in his time, and rivalling the sociological one to this day. And although many of his particular

conclusions were refuted or refined, the main idea has retained its value to the present.

8. The Philosophical and Sociological Conception of Morality

Since Durkheim considered society a moral unity of individuals, he clung to the conceptual scheme of 'sociologism' in his treatment of the nature, origin, and functions of morals, deducing morality from social conditions, the social milieu, and the social structure in his specific understanding.

He originally regarded morality as a system of objective rules of behaviour, the distinguishing feature of which was their compulsory character to which the individual could not help submitting. He considered duty to be the main attribute of morality. Doing one's duty made a person's behaviour moral. Subsequently his interest was held by the voluntary aspect of morality, and such features of it as desirability, acceptability, and the individual's personal interest in moral values (objective goods, social in their nature).

In trying to give a sociological explanation of both the origin and functioning of moral phenomena, Durkheim reinterpreted the modes of social determination of morals. In *The Division of Labor* he had affirmed the principle of the historical development of moral beliefs in accordance with morphological or structural factors. Later he stressed the significance of periods of mental uplift, 'movement of enthusiasm', and creative and innovating periods, which left their memory in the form of ideas, ideals, and values.[57] These ideas, etc., were upheld and reproduced again and again through the organisation of festivals, public religious and lay ceremonies, through preaching of all sort and dramatic productions in which people could come together and share in the same intellectual and moral life.[58]

In any case Durkheim affirmed the social essence of morality. When stressing the sacred character of morality,[59] he explained it by both religion and morality having society as their source and object, society which transcended the individual by its force and authority. Society demanded personal unselfishness and self-sacrifice—which were obligatory components of

morality. Kant, he said, postulated God because morality was unintelligible without that hypothesis. He (Durkheim) postulated a society specifically distinct from individuals, because morality was otherwise without object and duty without foundation.[60]

When linking morality with the social conditions giving rise to it, Durkheim did not consider it possible to bring out and substantiate a social ideal of a revolutionary character requiring a radical breaking up of the social structure. Whenever morality lagged behind the real conditions of society, it was only necessary, he considered, to bring it into accord with the changed structure, and no more.[61]

The idea of the determination of morality by a stable social structure led Durkheim to moral relativism. If all the forms of morality were conditioned identically by the existing structure, they were identically legitimate and there were no objective criteria for recognising the superiority of any one of them.

Underlying a social crisis, which (he considered) was mainly of a moral nature, was a change in the character and content of the collective consciousness. A rapid change of standards and values entailed a loss of past discipline and order in society. The morality of individualism was not yet established as the main social value and content of the collective conscience. The organic solidarity of modern society did not exclude a lack of rules of behaviour, which led to a state of anomy, a moral vacuum, and lack of standards. Modern society was therefore put into moral disorder and experienced social strife. The way out of the crisis was to strengthen moral regulation.

In Durkheim's conception the state, which 'thinks and acts' for all the rest of society, was the main agency fulfilling the function of 'collective mind' and defender of collective interests. He treated the role of the state in the spirit of liberalism, but foresaw the possibility of an excessive strengthening and hypertrophy of its functions at the expense of the individual's interests. The individual should be defended against extreme state control by 'secondary' or intermediate social groups (religious, production, etc.). In line with that Durkheim put forward the idea of special, particular moral codes regulating the behaviour of individuals as members of corresponding social groups, argued the need for historical study of these codes, and

developed the idea of the relativity of the moral requirements accepted in various professional circles. At the same time he called for the establishing of a rigid hierarchy of moral rules according to their social importance. Family, professional, and civil morality shaped the hierarchical structure, at whose pinnacle were the universal values and ideas embodied in the state. Durkheim reproduced the Comtean idea of the state as an agency of universal reconciliation and moral regulation of the interests of all the members of society, irrespective of the social, and class content of those interests.

The conception of an unconditional hierarchy of moral standards had a formal character and was aimed at maintaining stability of the social order.

In Durkheim's view a person's moral behaviour had three main, inherent features: a sense of discipline, membership of a group, and autonomy. He ascribed rather more significance to moral discipline and control, in essence equating discipline and morality. Only a human being was capable of consciously following discipline and only through that did freedom become possible. The social essence of morality was embodied in the feature of 'group membership', and the idea of conscious, voluntary observance of social prescriptions in 'autonomy'.

Durkheim connected his interpretation of the social functions of morality directly with the theory of education. The aim of education and upbringing was to mould a social being, to develop those qualities and properties of a child's personality that society needed. It was the business of education to transform the egoistic, unsocial creature that a child was initially, by the most effective means, into another being, capable of leading a moral and social life.

His treatment of the moral problems of modern times was based on his anthropological theory, and the conception of the duality of human nature, the conception of *Homo duplex.*

Man's social nature, created through education (standards, values, ideals) was contradicted by his biological nature (capabilities, biological functions, impulses, and passions). That made for incessant inner disquiet, and a sense of tension and alarm. Only society's controlling activity restrained man's biological nature and his passions and appetites, and put them into a certain context. When society relaxed its control over the individ-

ual, anomy rose, a state of the disintegration of society and the individual. In that social state there was no firm moral control of individual behaviour, and a kind of moral vacuum was created in which the old standards and values no longer played their role, and new ones had not yet been confirmed. This state opposed the moral order, regulation, and control that characterised the normal, 'healthy' state of society.

In *The Division of Labor* Durkheim considered anomy from the aspect of social structure, explaining it by lack of co-ordination of social functions from the growth and development of society. In *Suicide* he treated anomy as a moral crisis in which the system of normative control of individual needs and passions was disrupted through social upheavals, which led to loss of personal balance, and the feeling of belonging to a group, and to loss of discipline and social solidarity. Deviant behaviour was also a consequence of that.

Durkheim believed, in utopian fashion, that individual and social needs could be consciously regulated, and kept within the context of limitations dictated by the real social possibilities, while preserving capitalist social relations. That would prevent the rise of tension, spiritual crisis, feelings of disappointment and distress, and consequently of deviant behaviour.

In developing the problem of the social essence of morality, Durkheim expressed many true ideas. His recognition of social conditions as decisive for the genesis of morality was positive; so, too, was his analysis of the functional consequences of moral rules for society, and his recognition of their socio-cultural inconstancy on the one hand, and universality of the other.

The sociological interpretation of morality was very fruitful in principle, but Durkheim's conception was too abstract and one-sided. His arguments for society as the sole worthy moral goal were unsubstantiated and weak. One can hardly deny, for example, the moral value of the personality and of its harmonious development. And although Durkheim recognised and actively defended the rights and dignity of the individual, his theory did not allow him to examine the interaction of the individual and society dialectically in concrete historical conditions. The principle of the unconditional superiority of society over the individual was unsound. Abstract unhistorical collectivism was just as unjustified as the abstract individualism that

he constantly criticised. The relation of the individual and society, considered from the moral aspect, cannot be reduced to a relation of subordination. The relation between them is one of dialectical interaction.

9. The Philosophical and Sociological Conception of Religion

The conception of religion crowned the development of Durkheim's idea of collective consciousness as 'the highest form of the psychic life' or 'the consciousness of the consciousnesses'.[62] The attitude to religion traditional for positivism, as the supreme social institution that ensured the integration of society, acquired the form, with Durkheim, of quests for ways and means of a sociological explanation of religion under the influence of English and American anthropologists, in particular Sir James Frazer and Robertson Smith. Durkheim drew on anthropological material since he considered, in the spirit of early evolutionism, that 'all the essential elements of religious thought and life ought to be found, at least in germ, among the most primitive religions'.[63] He hoped, by studying totemism as the most primitive form of religion, to understand the essence and functions of religion in 'complex' societies which he considered to be 'only varieties of the same species'.[64]

When approaching the matter of defining religion from study of its primitive forms, Durkheim claimed that the idea of the supernatural and the idea of God were not necessary attributes of religion. He considered the division of all objects into two opposing classes, sanctified by religion (earthly—everyday, worldly, vulgar, and unclean; and sacred), an inherent feature of all religious beliefs without exception.

The sacred (1) had a taboo character, a separateness from earthly phenomena, and (2) was an object of aspiration, love, and respect. The sacred was thus simultaneously a source of constraint (taboo) and respect (authority). In Durkheim's view, that indicated the social nature of the sacred, since only society had such qualities: it was at once a source of authority, love, and adoration, and a source of constraint. The sacred embodied the collective force, and inculcated the idea of the common in

individual consciousness, and connected it with something that transcended it.

The earthly was linked with man's everyday life, and his everyday individual occupations, private interests, and egoistic passions. The dichotomy of the sacred and earthly thus went back, in Durkheim, to the dichotomy of the social and the individual. He defined religion as follows:

> A religion is a unified system of beliefs and practices relative to sacred things, that is to say, things set apart and forbidden—beliefs and practices which unite into one single moral community called the Church, all those who adhere to them.[65]

By 'Church' he meant an organisation that organised a group's religious life. Even among primitive peoples there were 'churches', i.e., people who looked after the timely and proper holding of religious rites and ceremonies. His main example of lay, 'vulgar' activity, was labour, the source of grief and sorrow; an example of sacred activity was collective religious ceremonies and rituals, the source of joy and a heightened state of the spirit. He repeatedly declared that his definition was far from acceptable to everyone. Its main sign was the performance of rituals directed to sacred objects, from manipulation of which the solidarity of the group gathered force, and the common, collective consciousness was reinforced, which kept up the spirits of the individuals and gave them the confidence necessary for life.

As the theorist of 'sociologism' Durkheim considered that neither physical nor biological causes could explain religion and its origin and essence. He therefore rejected animism, which deduced religion from notions about an immortal soul (Edward Taylor), and 'naturism', which deduced religion from involuntary adoration of physical natural forces (Max Müller, and others). These theories were based on an idea that 'man has superimposed on the reality available to observation an unreal world built almost completely from the fanstastic images that trouble his spirit in dreams'.[66] The researcher's task was to find the objectively existing reality that was the cause, object, and goal of religious beliefs and ceremonies. That reality was society.

In developing his sociological conception of religion, Durkheim expressed a number of ideas relative to the various types of relations between the social reality and religion. He considered religion a social phenomenon in at least three senses: (1) as a socially determined phenomenon; (2) as the embodiment of notions of social reality in the collective consciousness (that type of analysis was based on an identification of religious notions with society, and an ontologisation of collective notions); (3) as a phenomenon with functional social consequences (which meant, in the context of Durkheim's conception, analysis of religion as a phenomenon meeting certain social needs).

When examining religion from the angle of its origin he saw its source in the features of the social milieu. In *The Division of Labor,* in which the causal explanation was still clearly differentiated from other types of sociological analysis, he had advanced the thesis that religion could not be the basis of primitive societies; although it permeated their core, it could not be the cause of social structures, for 'on the contrary it is the latter ... that explain the power and nature of the religious idea'.[67] Durkheim's pointing out of the structure of primitive society and its social organisation (a reflection and expression of which was totemism as a religious system) was a concretisation of the requirement to deduce the social from the social. The statement that 'religion is the product of social causes',[68] presupposed the existence of a causal dependence between society and religion, and recognition of the causal priority of society. In this case Durkheim understood by social the morphological features of the social facts: the structure of society and the intensity of its members' social intercourse. The true source of religiosity was the coming together of the group.

Durkheim always regarded social intercourse as a positive fact, as a good that brought people joy and inspiration. It could only, in his view, be extra-economic intercourse, taking place outside the labour process. So an idea of two qualitatively opposed worlds was created, viz., the everyday world and the sacred, which evoked belief in the great transforming power of collectivity.

Some researchers see a link between Durkheim's theory of collective inspiration and the crowd psychology developed at that time (Le Bon and others).

Examination of religion as a special form of expression of the social forces that subordinate individuals to themselves has a notable place in *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life.* The starting point was the idea of the identity of society and collective notions, and the statement that society 'is the consciousness of the consciousnesses'.[69] The thesis of society as primary in relation to collective consciousness was replaced by the idea that religious notions created society. By identifying social consciousness with religious conscience Durkheim claimed that the god of believers 'is only a figurative expression of the society',[70] while 'the sacred principle is nothing more or less than society transfigured and personified'.[71] Religion was thus society itself, or rather the focus of all aspects of society that shared the quality of sacredness, so that the influence of religion on culture and the personality, and also on the principal patterns of human thought was almost limitless. Society was the author and object of the religious cult and dogmas; it created religion and evoked religious worship; it was simultaneously god and believer.

An important, and, moreover, very original element of Durkheim's analysis of religion was his posing of it as a symbolic system, a system of signs, in which sociological analysis would come to see the reality that was the basis of religion, viz., society.

In concluding that the main component of religion was not its dogmatic part but the religious activity expressed in the collective observance of rituals, Durkheim drew a conclusion about the positive social function of religion. The cult, he thought, was aimed at realising the dualism of the sacred and the profane in people's behaviour. All religious rites were accordingly divisible into two kinds—negative and positive. The aim of the first was to draw a sharp line between the sacred and the profane, and to prevent desecration of the sacred by the profane, to bring man closer to the sacred through self-renunciation, self-abasement, or extreme asceticism. The task of a positive cult was to acquaint believers with the sacred world. Durkheim distinguished the following main social functions in cult practice: a disciplinary one, or function of coercion or control; a cementing function, i.e., one of reinforcing and consolidating social unity; a reproductive function by which the social heritage was

passed on to a new generation; and finally an euphoric function consisting in the creation of joyful feelings of social well-being. All these social functions of religious rites supported and strengthened society's social solidarity, and at the level of the individual strengthened belief in his/her powers.

A by-product of Durkheim's sociological analysis of religion was an analysis of the content of human consciousness and of the origin of the main logical capacities: the classification and creation of general concepts. He explained both abilities as the consequence of social, religious life, as 'a product of religious thought', abounding in social content.[72] Having rejected empiricism and apriorism, which could not explain the universal character of categories, Durkheim employed a structural approach and asserted that the content of general concepts included various aspects of social being. The idea of time, he claimed, arose from the observation of regular sacred rites and ceremonies. Their repetition, together with the regularity of the lunar and solar cycles, produced the concepts of periodicity, duration, and temporality. In the same way the category of space was said to have appeared from an identical evaluation and differentiation of space by people of one and the same civilisation. The objectivity of categories was due to their collective character, general significance, and universal recognition and use.

When examining the relationship of religion and science, Durkheim considered the latter a continuation and perfecting of the former, on the grounds that religion expressed true, really existing relations. His rejection of an epistemological analysis of the forms of social consciousness led him to a misunderstanding of their specific nature, and to asserting their kinship and continuity. He declared religion to be eternal, since there would always be a need to clothe the relations of man and society in an ideological form. He ascribed the general features of ideology, understood extremely broadly and formally, to religion.

Having proclaimed a religion without a god by putting society on a divine pedestal, Durkheim was seemingly aware that the problem of the individual (which he always regarded as depending on the problem of society) remained theoretically resolved. The conception of the individual could only be organically linked

with that of society by recognising the underlying role of social-production activity, which linked man with his environment and social milieu, and made him the creator of history. In rejecting the decisive role of the economy Durkheim approached the problem from the other end. From the thesis that the field of traditional religion was contracting more and more, he came to claim that collective consciousness was acquiring a new content and form in contemporaneous society that was embodied in the 'religion of humanity', a rational expression of which was the morality of individualism. As society developed, respect for the individual became a kind of social dogma; the collective social forces found expression in the cult of the individual. An attitude to man as the individual embodiment of divinity could, in Durkheim's opinion, explain such an unexpected change in the object of worship. But he did not manage to adduce convincing theoretical arguments. He could not prove that the idea of abstract bourgeois humanism in fact became the ideology of all classes of capitalist society on the basis of which its ideological unity was produced.

By depriving the concept of religion of its main component, viz., belief in the supernatural, in God, and defending a broad interpretation of religion as a system of beliefs and rituals that concerned some sort of socially significant object, Durkheim in essence identified religion with an abstract ideology of timeless, eternal character manifested identically in any society.

The principle of evolutionism, that primitive social forms already contained all the features of the phenomenon of religion, enabled Durkheim to draw a conclusion about its integrating role in all human formations. Considering society the sole object of religious worship (society as the embodiment of harmonious accord), he did not bring out the true causes of this deification, which was only possible under the antagonistic social relations which functioned in a disguised, false form, alienated from the individual. The objective reasons for this alienation of society from the individual that made an irrational explanation of the fact of religion possible, remained undisclosed in this case. And I see in that the main fault of the sociological analysis that ignores the existence of classes, and of class relations, as the objective material basis of social life.

10. Durkheim's Place in the History of Sociology. 'Sociologism' and Marxism

Durkheim's influence on capitalist sociology is now widely recognised. He drew attention to many key, fundamental problems of sociological science; and that, in particular, can explain his popularity in France at the end of the nineteenth century and in the first third of the twentieth, the spread of the influence of his ideas to other countries in Europe and America, and the interest shown in them at the present time.[73]

The nature of society, its integrative principle, its healthy and pathological states, the essence and functions of social consciousness, the methods of sociological investigation, and the status of sociology as a science, which were all problems that Durkheim tackled from positions of a quite integral philosophical and sociological conception, were undoubtedly among the most important matters of theoretical sociology. The increasing influence of the Marxian methodology on bourgeois social thought in our day is encouraging a new interpretation of them in many ways. The theories of Marx, Durkheim, Weber, and Pareto are more and more being juxtaposed in present quests for an answer to the problems of the development of the modern world.[74]

The general theoretical theses of 'sociologism' underlie the principles of the structural functionalism school. It was not without reason that the *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences,* when defining Durkheim's place and significance in the history of sociology, called him 'one of the two principal founders of the modern phase of sociological theory'.[75] Structural functionalism based its theoretical, methodological conception on the theses, developed by Durkheim, of society as a self-regulating system with qualities not reducible to those of the separate elements, of public order as the normal state of society, and of the significance of the institutions of education and control, and of the principles of the functional approach to analysis of social phenomena from the standpoint of the role they perform in the system. It would not be an exaggeration to say that the directions of the analysis of society pointed out by Durkheim, taken as a whole, are the basic theoretical equipment of present-day structural functionalism.

Durkheim's interest in manifestations of social crisis, and his stressing of attention to their social conditioning, made it possible for his opponents and critics among Western economists and sociologists to compare 'sociologism' with certain propositions of the theory of Marxism. He began to be reproached with collectivism and materialism already after publication of his first works. Paul Barth, for instance, put 'sociologism' and Marxism in one and the same group of social doctrines, which he called 'the economic conception of history' in his *The Philosophy of History as Sociology*. In today's Western literature attempts to compare him and Marx are often met, parallels between them drawn, and features of similarity brought out that allegedly occurred in their answers to certain fundamental matters of sociological theory.

Durkheim was quite familiar with certain of Marx's main works, had read *Capital*, recognised its significance, and expressed his attitude to some of the main theoretical theses of Marxism. When criticising Marxism, he identified it with vulgar economic determinism, assertions of a linear causal dependence of social phenomena on economic factors, and non-recognition of a feedback of ideas on economic affairs. He himself thus defined the point at which his sociological conception was close to Marxism, namely, in the 'idea that social life should be explained not by the conception that those involved in it hold, but by deep causes that escape consciousness'.[76]

While recognising the scientific value of the idea of the objectivity of social life, Durkheim, however, did not understand the same thing by objectivity as Marx. In his interpretation it was the independence of social phenomena from individual consciousness and the individual's ideas, and the objective existence of collective consciousness in relation to that of the individual. In Marx's understanding of it, the objectivity of socio-historical reality was the natural-history character of the development of society, following laws that did not depend, in the last analysis, on any consciousness, either individual or collective.

While insisting on the primacy of the social, Durkheim understood by it primarily the ideological, or rather the moral. He identified the social and the moral milieus. Marx, however, did not reduce social relations exclusively to economic ones, and recognised the existence of social ties (family, national, class,

group), considering material relations of production the basic ones on which other relations were built up and through which they acquired a concrete historical content.

Durkheim's attitude to the economy was typical of him. While treating it in a simplified way, as a state of industrial technology, he considered that economic ties did not form firm social contacts. In his opinion, economic activity was asocial. His 'social types', by which he had in mind the societies of different historical periods, signified a single complex of ecological, demographic, and ideological factors. The last, he considered, were determinant. His 'social types' had nothing in common with the Marxian concept of a socio-economic formation, for which recognition of the decisive role of the relations of production in it, the division of society into classes, and explanation of the ideological and other spiritual spheres as reflections of class positions and interests were characteristic.

Durkheim and his followers began their explanation of the patterns of social life from what he called collective conscience. The origin and essence of that, in his opinion, thus depended directly on the intercourse between individuals considered outside any concrete historical conditions, and outside people's concrete, historical activity. He regarded the complex business of intercourse and communion solely as the psychological interaction of individuals during collective gatherings, ceremonies, religious festivals and rituals.

Durkheim idealised social relations and treated them as relations of concord, solidarity, harmony, and co-operation. He treated social conflicts and contradictions that went beyond the limits of 'normal', natural social order and as a sickness that could be eliminated without altering the main social foundations. The basic inspiration of 'sociologism' was concentrated in that conservative orientation, deeply hostile to the revolutionary spirit of Marxism, and the essence of its theory, and in any case to the explanation of development as a struggle of opposing social forces.

The global treatment of social consciousness as an aggregate of collective notions, without distinguishing the essential specific nature of its separate norms, replacement of the question of the essence of the various forms of social consciousness by that of their functions, a hyperbolisation of certain functions, and

the replacement of all of them in essence, by one, the integrational—such were the epistemological roots of Durkheim's 'sociologism'.

The contradictions of this conception were based on the contradiction between his naturalistic objective methodology and the spiritualist theory of collective consciousness, identified with society.

Profoundly and acutely sensing the social crisis, Durkheim suggested that it could lead to fatal results if not ended. All his efforts were therefore directed to maintaining the foundations of the existing social organisation, and to reforming and improving it. 'Sociologism' served, as a conception, to justify this aim.

It is significant that the efforts of Western sociologists in our day to justify the existence of capitalism theoretically and to find a way out of the crisis, are based on the ideas and conceptions of Durkheim, who made the problem of the crisis of the capitalist world the keystone of sociology. In that respect the conceptions of the 'neoconservatives' (Daniel Bell, Robert Nisbeth, Seymour Lipset, Nathan Glazer, Samuel Huntington, Daniel Moynihan, and others) are characteristic; in their publications they reproduce and rework Durkheim's conceptions about social order and anomy, and about the meritocracy (just remuneration for services in accordance with work and talents), social egoism, which allegedly leads to ever increasing claims by the broad masses, and expounding pessimistic views of human nature, and of the need, in that connection, to strengthen social control and the 'social authority' of leaders.

The French Marxist Michel Dion has justly said in his *Sociologie et idéologie,* that sociology is involved in the 'great battles' of our epoch, that it 'either favours maintenance of the old capitalist society' or, on the contrary, 'works to replace it by a socialist society'.[77] While defending Durkheim against leftists' accusations of 'reactionary diversion', Dion said that the ambiguity of sociologism was due to Durkheim's belonging 'to a class, the bourgeois class, that still believes, or wants to believe, that its social system and values are eternal'.[78] It is in that that one must seek the sources of the contradictoriness of Durkheim's conception, which differs favourably from non-scientific theological and subjective-idealist conceptions. His critique of

biological and psychological reductionism in sociology, his pointing out of the need to unite sociology and philosophy, and his critique of abstract speculations, and of juggling empirical facts not directed by theory, have not lost their topicality to this day.

But, in comparison with scientific Marxist-Leninist sociology, 'sociologism' was unsound as regards both methodology and theory.

Notes

[1] In what follows I shall refer to these works by the abbreviated titles *Division of Labor* and *The Rules.*

[2] In the pamphlets *L'Allemagne au dessus de tout* (1915) and *Qui a voulu la guerre* (Germany Above All, and Who Wanted the War?) Durkheim charged Germany with guilt for the war disasters.

[3] Emile Durkheim. *Socialism and Saint-Simon.* Translated by Charlotte Sattler (The Antioch Press, Yellow Springs, 1958) p. 5.

[4] *Ibid.*, p 7.

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 25-26.

[6] Emile Durkheim. *Les règles de la méthode sociologique* (Felix Alcan, Paris, 1895), p 19.

[7] Georges Davy. Emile Durkheim. *Revue française de sociologie,* 1960, *1,* 1: 3-24.

[8] Emile Durkheim. Sociology and Its Scientific Field. In: Kurt H. Wolff (Ed.). *Emile Durkheim, 1858-1917. A Collection of Essays* (Ohio State U.P., Columbus, Ohio, 1960), pp. 354-375.

[9] The idea of 'sociologism' is encountered in the works of many of Durkheim's contemporaries (Alfred Espinas, Jean Izoulet, Eugène de Roberty).

[10] Emile Durkheim. *The Division of Labor in Society.* Translated by G. Simpson (The Free Press, New York, 1956).

[11] Emile Durkheim. *Les règles,* p 128.

[12] Harry Alpert. *Emile Durkheim and His Sociology* (Columbia U.P., New York, 1939); Anthony Giddens. *Capitalism and Modern Social Theory. An Analysis of the Writings of Marx, Durkheim and Max Weber* (Cambridge U.P., London, 1971); Steven Lukes. *Emile Durkheim. His Life and Work. A Historical and Critical Study* (Allen Lane, London, 1973); Hans-Peter Müller. *Wertkrise und Gesellschaftsreform: Emile Durkheims Schriften zur Politik* (Enke, Stuttgart, 1983).

[13] Emile Durkheim. *Le suicide,* p. 362.

[14] *Ibid.,* pp 14-15.

[15] Emile Durkheim. *Sociologie et philosophie* (Presses Universitaires de France, Paris, 1967), p 67.

[16] See Célestin Bouglé's preface to Durkheim's *Sociologie et philosophie, Op. cit.,* p IX.

[17] *Ibid.*

[18] Emile Durkheim. *Les règles,* p 20.

[19] *Ibid.*

[20] *Ibid.,* p 54.

[21] *Ibid.,* p 23.

[22] Emile Durkheim. *The Division of Labor in Society,* p 49.

[23] See *Les règles,* pp. 78-80.

[24] *Ibid.,* p 80.

[25] Durkheim occasionally came close to another, more scientific understanding of the norm as the optimum variant of the functioning of society, and sometimes identified the norm with the ideal.

[26] *The Division of Labor in Society,* p 173.

[27] *Ibid.,* p 45.

[28] The typologies of Comte, Spencer, Tönnies, and others are such.

[29] *The Division of Labor,* p. 169.

[30] *Ibid.*

[31] *Ibid.,* p 401.

[32] *Ibid.,* p 111.

[33] *Ibid.,* p 364.

[34] *Ibid.,* p 172.

[35] *Ibid.*

[36] *Ibid.,* p 368.

[37] *Ibid.,* p 370.

[38] *Ibid.*

[39] *Ibid.,* p 375.

[40] *Ibid.,* p 384.

[41] *Ibid.,* p 371.

[42] *Ibid.,* p 372.

[43] *Ibid.,* p 375.

[44] *Ibid.,* p 381.

[45] *Ibid.,* p 389.

[46] *Ibid.,* p 464.

[47] Emile Durkheim. *Le suicide,* p VII.

[48] *Ibid.*

[49] *Ibid.*, p 148.

[50] *Ibid.*, p 223.

[51] *Ibid.*, p 141.

[52] *Ibid.*, p 229.

[53] *Ibid.*, p 311.

[54] *Ibid.*, p 277.

[55] Hans-Peter Müller. *Op. cit.*

[56] Whitney Pope. *Durkheim's 'Suicide'. A Classic Analyzed* (University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1976).

[57] Emile Durkheim. *Sociologie et philosophie*, p 134.

[58] *Ibid.*, p 135.

[59] *Ibid.*, p 101.

[60] *Ibid.*, p 74.

[61] *Ibid.*, p 51.

[62] Emile Durkheim. *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life.* Translated by J. W. Swain (Allen & Unwin, London, 1915; reprinted by The Free Press, New York, 1965), p 492.

[63] *Ibid.*, p 354.

[64] *Ibid.*, p 114.

[65] *Ibid.*, p 62.

[66] *Ibid.*, p 322.

[67] Emile Durkheim. *The Division of Labor*, p 179.

[68] Emile Durkheim. *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*, p. 472.

[69] *Ibid.*, p 492.

[70] *Ibid.*, p 258.

[71] *Ibid.*, p 347.

[72] *Ibid.*, p 22.

[73] See Robert Reiner, Steve Fenton, and Jan Hummett. *Durkheim and Modern Sociology* (CUP, Cambridge, 1984).

[74] See Anthony Giddens. *Capitalism and Modern Social Theory.*

[75] *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, Vol. 4 (The Macmillan Co. and The Free Press, New York, 1968), p 311.

[76] Emile Durkheim. Antonio Labriola. Essais sur la conception materialiste de l'histoire (Paris, Giard et Briere). In: *Revue philosophique de la France et de l'étranger*; 1897, *44*, July to December: 648.

[77] Michel Dion. *Sociologie et idéologie* (Editions sociales, Paris, 1973), p 60.

[78] *Ibid.*, pp 68-69.

11

THE SOCIOLOGY OF MAX WEBER

Piama Haidenko

1. Max Weber and His Times

The moulding of Max Weber's socio-political views and theoretical position was largely detemined by the social and political situation in Germany in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, and by the state of science at that time, above all the state of political economy, history, and social philosophy.

A struggle of two social forces was characteristic of the situation in Germany then: viz., the Junkers, associated with large-scale landowning, who were departing from the historical scene, and the consolidating capitalist class, striving for political independence. A specific feature of the development of capitalism in Germany was that it could never free itself from the shackles of the feudal-bureaucratic system; that put its stamp both on the political life of Germany and on the character of scientific thinking, above all, of course, in the field of the social sciences.

The self-awareness of the German capitalist class was moulded at a time when a new class, the proletariat, had appeared in the historical arena. The German bourgeoisie had been forced to fight on two fronts: against the conservative, defensive tendencies of big landowners, on the one hand, and against Social Democracy, on the other. That determined its dual character, its political indecisiveness, and the contradictory nature of the position of its theorists.

Max Weber (1864-1920) was one of the latter. He grew up in a well-to-do bourgeois family, and acquired a taste for politics in his early youth. In his political orientation he was a liberal whose views had the nationalist hue caused by the peculiarities of Germany's historical development in the nineteenth century.

Weber studied jurisprudence in Heidelberg University, but his interests were not limited to that one field; in his student years he was also occupied with political economy and economic history; and his studies in jurisprudence were also of a historical character. That was due to the influence of the so-called historical school which predominated in German political economy in the last quarter of the century (Wilhelm Roscher, Kurt Knies, Gustav Schmoller). The members of this school, who were sceptical toward classical English political economy, were oriented not so much on the construction of a single theory as on bringing out the inner links between economic development and the legal, ethnographic, psychological, and moral and religious aspects of society's life. They tried to establish this link by historical analysis. That posing of the matter was largely dictated by the specific conditions of Germany's development. As a bureaucratic state with remnants of the feudal system, Germany was unlike England; Germans therefore never fully shared the principles of individualism and utilitarianism that underlay the classical political economy of Adam Smith and Ricardo.

Weber's first works—*Zur Geschichte der Handelgesellschaften in Mittelalter* (On the History of Merchant Guilds in the Middle Ages) (1889), *Die römische Agrargeschichte in ihrer Bedeutung für das Staats- und Privaterecht* (Roman Agrarian History and Its Significance for Public and Private Law) (1891), which immediately set him among the major German scholars—are evidence that he had mastered the requirements of the historical school, and knew how to employ historical analysis to bring out the link of economic relations with public law formations. In *Roman Agrarian History* he had already plotted the outlines of his 'empirical sociology' (as he called it), which was closely linked with history. He treated the evolution of landowning in antiquity in connection with social and political evolution, turning as well to analysis of the forms of family organisation, daily life, morals, religious cults, etc.

His interest in the agrarian question had a quite real underlying political motive; in the 1890s he published a number of papers and reports on the agrarian question in Germany, in which he criticised the position of the conservative Junkers and defended Germany's industrial road of development.

At the same time he tried to develop a new political platform for bourgeois liberalism in the conditions of the transition to state-monopoly capitalism that was already making itself felt in Germany.

Weber was a professor of Freiburg University from 1894, and from 1896 in Heidelberg. In 1904 he was invited to St. Louis, in the USA, to read a course of lectures. He brought back many impressions from his journey, and his reflections on the socio-political system of America strongly influenced his development as a sociologist.

> Labor, immigration, the Negro problem, politicians—those were the things that caught his interest. When he returned to Germany, he did so with the conviction that professional machine politics were essential for modern mass democracy if a countervailing power to a bureaucratic mandarin class of civil servants are to be created.[1]

In 1904 he became the editor (along with Werner Sombart) of the sociological journal *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik,* in which the most important of his works appeared, including (in 1905) the world-famous study translated as *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism.* This study was the beginning of a series of publications on the sociology of religion on which he was engaged right up to his death. He regarded his works on sociology as a polemic against Marxism; it was not by chance that he called the lectures on the sociology of religion that he read in Vienna University in 1918 'a positive critique of the materialist conception of history'. But he interpreted the materialist understanding of history in too vulgar and simplified a way, identifying it with economic materialism. At the same time he reflected on problems of logic and the methodology of the social sciences; a series of papers appeared on these problems between 1903 and 1905.

The range of Weber's interest in that period was unusually broad: he occupied himself with the ancient, mediaeval, and

modern history of the economy, law, religion, and even art; reflected on the nature, history, and future fate of modern capitalism; studied the problem of capitalist urbanisation, and in that connection the history of the ancient and mediaeval town; he investigated the specific nature of contemporaneous science in its differences from other historical forms of knowledge; and he took a lively interest in the political situation not only in Germany but also outside it, including America and Russia.

Weber worked from 1919 in the University of Munich. Between 1916 and 1919 he published one of his main works (*The Economic Ethics of World Religions*), a study on which he was working to the end of his life. Among his other important works were *Politik als Beruf* (Politics as a Vocation) (1919) and *Wissenschaft als Beruf* (Science as a Vocation) (1920). They reflected his mental mood after World War I, his discontent with Germany's policy in the Weimar period, and his very gloomy view of the future of capitalist industrial civilisation.

Weber died in 1920 without having accomplished all his intentions. His fundamental work *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft* (1921) (translated as *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization),* in which he summed up his sociological studies, and collections of articles on the methodology and logic of cultural-historical and sociological studies, on the sociology of religion, politics, and the sociology of music, were published posthumously.

2. Methodological Problems of the Sciences of Culture

The methodological principles of Weber's sociology were closely linked with the theoretical situation of non-Marxian social science at the end of the nineteenth century. It is especially important to understand his attitude to the ideas of Dilthey and the neo-Kantians properly.

The problem of the general significance of the sciences of culture was central to Weber's work. On one point he was agreed with Dilthey: he shared the latter's antinaturalism and was convinced that it was impossible, when studying human activity, to start from the same methodological principles that the astronomer used when studying the motion of celestial bodies. Like Dilthey, he considered that neither the historian, nor the sociol-

ogist, nor the economist could ignore the fact that man is a conscious being. But Weber resolutely rejected being guided, in the study of social life, by the method of direct experience and intuition, since the result of such a mode of study lacked general significance.

According to him, the main mistake of Dilthey and his followers was psychologism. Instead of studying the psychological process of the origin of certain ideas in the historian from the angle that these ideas appeared somehow in his mind, and how he subjectively arrived at an understanding of the link between them, in other words, instead of investigating the world of the historian's experiences, Weber proposed studying the logic of the formation of the concepts the historian relied on, because only expression in the form of generally significant concepts of what 'was obtained intuitively' converted the subjective world of the historian's notions into the objective world of historical science.

In his methodological studies, Weber essentially adhered to the neo-Kantian variant of the antinaturalist substantiation of history.

Following in the footsteps of Heinrich Rickert, Weber distinguished two acts—value orientation and evaluation; while the first converted our individual impression into an objective, generally significant judgment, the second did not go beyond subjectivity. The science of culture, society, and history, he declared, should be just as free of value judgments as the natural sciences.

That requirement did not mean that the scholar should in general reject his own evaluations and tastes; they should simply not invade the limits of his scientific judgments. Beyond those limits he had the right to express them as was convenient, but always as a private person, and not as a scientist.

Weber substantially amended Rickert's premisses, however. Unlike the latter, who treated values and their hierarchy as something suprahistorical, Weber inclined to treat value as an orientation of some historical period, as the direction of interest inherent in the given age. Values were thus transferred from the realm of the suprahistorical to history, and the neo-Kantian doctrine of values was brought close to positivism. The expression 'value orientation' meant only a philosophical interpreta-

tion of the specifically scientific 'interests' that guided the choice and working up of the object of empirical investigation.[2]

The interest of the age was something more stable and objective than simply the researcher's private interest, but at the same time it was something much more subjective than the suprahistorical interest that neo-Kantians called 'values'. For Rickert values were rooted in a suprahistorical reality, the transcendental subject.

By converting them into the 'interest of the age', i.e., into something relative, Weber thereby gave new meaning to Rickert's doctrine.

Since values, according to Weber, were only an expression of the general set-up of their time, every age had its own 'absolutes'. The absolute thus proved to be historical, and so relative.

3. The Ideal Type as a Logical Construct

Weber was one of the greatest historians and sociologists who tried consciously to apply the neo-Kantian instrumental concepts in the practice of empirical research.

Rickert's doctrine of concepts as means of overcoming the intensive and extensive diversity of empirical reality was refracted in an original way with Weber into the category of the 'ideal type'. Speaking generally, the ideal type was the 'interest of the age' expressed in the form of a theoretical construct. The ideal type was thus not derived from empirical reality, but was constructed as a theoretical scheme. In that sense Weber called it a 'utopia'.

> The more sharply and precisely the ideal type has been constructed, thus the more abstract and unrealistic (weltfremder) in this sense it is, the better it is able to perform its methodological functions in formulating the classification of terminology, and in the formulation of classifications, and of hypotheses.[3]

Weber's ideal type is thus close to the ideal model employed in natural science. Weber himself well understood that. The mental constructs called ideal types, he said, could be encountered just as little in reality as physical reactions that are calcula-

ted only by assuming an absolutely empty space.[4] He called the ideal type a product of our fantasy, a purely mental formation created by ourselves, thereby stressing its extra-empirical origin. Just as an ideal model was constructed by the natural scientist as an instrument and means for knowing nature, so the ideal type was created as a tool for comprehending historical reality. He considered that the formation of abstract ideal types should be treated not as a goal but as a means.[5] It was because of its separation from empirical reality, and difference from it, that the ideal type could serve as a sort of scale for comparing reality with it.

Such concepts as 'economic exchange', *'Homo oekonomicus'*, 'craft', 'capitalism', 'Church' 'sect', 'Christianity', 'mediaeval urban economy', were (according to Weber) typical-ideal constructs employed as a means to describe individual historical formations. He considered the 'realistic' interpretation (in the mediaeval meaning of the word) of ideal types to be one of the commonest errors, i.e., the identifying of these mental constructs with historical, cultural reality itself and their 'substantialising'.

But difficulties arose for him here connected with the question of how an ideal type was constructed. As regards their content these constructions had a utopian character arising from the mental accentuation of certain elements of reality in it.[6] We easily discover contradictions here in the treatment of the ideal type. On the one hand, Weber, in fact, stressed that ideal types were a 'utopia', a 'fantasy'. On the other hand, it turned out that they were drawn from reality itself, albeit in a way that 'deformed' them, i.e., by accentuating, singling out, and sharpening elements that seemed typical to the investigator.

So, what was the ideal type: an apriori construct or an empirical generalisation? The singling out of certain elements of reality so as to form a concept, for example, like 'urban craft guild economy', seemingly presupposed singling out something from individual phenomena which, if not common to them all, was at least typical of many. That procedure was directly counterposed to the formation of individualised historical concepts as Rickert imagined them; it rather resembled the formation of generalising concepts.

In order to resolve the contradiction Weber drew a line be-

tween historical and sociological ideal types.

Rickert had already noted that sociology as a science, in contrast to history, had to be classed among the nomothetic sciences that employed a generalising method. General concepts functioned in them as an end of knowledge, not as the means; the mode of forming sociological concepts, according to him, did not differ logically from the way concepts of the natural sciences were formed. The peculiarity of Weber's conception of the ideal type, and of the whole series of difficulties associated with it, was due to its being for him a methodological principle of both sociological and historical knowledge. As A. Walter noted in his article *Max Weber als Soziologe,* the individualising and generalising tendencies in Weber were always interwoven, since history and sociology were often inseparable for him.[7]

When Weber first introduced the concept of the ideal type in his methodological works of 1904, he regarded it mainly as a means of historical knowledge, as a historical ideal type. That was why he stressed that it was only a means of knowledge, and not an end.

Weber differed from Rickert in his very understanding of the job of history; he did not limit himself to reconstructing 'what in fact had been', as Rickert recommended, oriented on Leopold Ranke's historical school, but was rather inclined to subject the historically individual to causal analysis. He was thereby already introducing an element of generalisation into historical research, with the result that the difference between history and sociology was considerably reduced. Weber wrote, when defining the role of the ideal type in history and sociology, that sociology (it had often been suggested as going without saying) created concepts of types and looked for general rules of events in contrast to history, which aspired to causal analysis of individual, culturally important actions, formations, and personalities.

The task of history, according to Weber, was thus to establish causal connections between individual historical formations. The ideal type served a means for that of disclosing the genetic connection of historical phenomena; he therefore called it the genetic ideal type.[8]

What was the sociological ideal type? If, according to Weber, history should strive after a causal analysis of individual phenomena, i.e., phenomena localised in time and space, the job of

sociology was to establish the *general rules of events* irrespective of their space-time determination. In that sense ideal types, as instruments of sociological research, should obviously be more general, and could be called 'pure ideal types' in contrast to genetic ideal ones. The sociologist thus constructed *pure* ideal models of dominance (charismatic, rational, and patriarchal) that were encountered in all historical epochs at any point of the globe. 'Pure types' were more suitable in research the 'purer' they were, i.e., the further away from real, empirically existing phenomena.

Weber compared the 'pure types' of sociology with the ideal-typical constructions of political economy in the sense that (1) in both cases there was the organisation of a human action *as if* it had taken place in *ideal conditions,* and (2) both disciplines treated this ideal form of the course of the action independently of the local conditions of place and time. It was assumed that if the ideal conditions were met, then the action would be performed in precisely the same way in any epoch and any country. The difference of conditions and their effect on the course of events were established, according the Weber, by their deviation from the ideal type, which was always encountered, but only an ideal-type construction made it possible to note and express this deviation in general concepts.

As one of Weber's students has noted, genetic ideal types differed from pure ones only in degree of commonality. The genetic type was employed locally in time and space, but the application of the pure type was not localised; the genetic type was a means of bringing out a connection that only occurred once, while the pure type was a means of bringing out a connection that had always existed; Rickert's qualitative difference between history and sociology was changed into a quantitative one in Weber.

As for the formation of historical concepts, Weber departed from Rickert in accentuating the generalisation aspect. In sociology, on the contrary, Weber softened Rickert's nomothetic principle by introducing an element of 'individualisation'. The latter was expressed in Weber's refusing to establish laws of social life, and his limiting himself to the more modest task of establishing rules of the passage of social events.

To sum up, we can now thus say that the contradictions that

arose in connection with Weber's forming of ideal-type concepts were largely connected with the different functions and different origin of ideal types in history and sociology. While it could be said in reference to the historical ideal type that it was a means of knowledge, but not its end, that was not always so with regard to the sociological ideal type. Furthermore, whereas the ideal type introduced an element of the general in history, in sociology it performed the function rather of replacing law-governed connections by typical ones. Thus, by means of the ideal type, Weber considerably reduced the gap between history and sociology that divided them in the theory of the Baden school. In that respect the German sociologist Hans Freyer was right when he remarked that the concept of the ideal type made the opposition of the individualising and the generalising modes of thought less pronounced since, on the one hand, it brought out what was characteristic in the individual and, on the other hand, came only to the typical through generalisation, and not to a general validity of laws.[9]

4. The Problem of Understanding and the Category of 'Social Action'

In order to show how Weber's concept of the ideal type was applied, we must analyse it from the angle of its content, and for that it is necessary to introduce another category of his sociology, namely that of understanding (*Verstehen*). However paradoxical it may seem, Weber was compelled to employ a category in his researches that he had objected to in Dilthey, Croce, and other spokesmen of intuitivism, though 'understanding' had a different meaning for him than in intuitivism.

A need to understand the subject-matter of its study distinguished sociology from the natural sciences, according to Weber. Human behaviour, like all events, he said, displayed both connections and regularities in its course. But what distinguished human behaviour alone was connections and patterns whose course was understandably *(verständlich)* explicable.[10] The fact that human behaviour was subject to intelligent interpretation presupposed a specific difference between the science of behaviour (sociology) and the natural sciences. It was in that

point that Dilthey had seen the difference between the sciences of the mind and the sciences of nature.

Weber, however, immediately rushed to distance himself from Dilthey; he did not counterpose 'understanding' to causal 'explanation' but, on the contrary, linked them closely together.

> Sociology (in the sense in which this highly ambiguous word is used here) [he wrote] is a science which attempts the interpretive understanding *(deutend verstehen)* of social action *in order* thereby *to arrive at a causal explanation* of its course and effects [italics added].[11]

The difference between his category of understanding and Dilthey's corresponding one was not only that Weber's understanding preceded explanation, while Dilthey *counterposed* them, but that understanding, according to Weber, was not a psychological category as Dilthey supposed, and interpretive sociology, accordingly, was not a part of psychology.[12]

Let us examine Weber's reasoning. Sociology, according to him, should, like history, take the behaviour of the individual or of a group of individuals as its starting point. The separate individual and his behaviour were the 'cell' of sociology and history, their 'atom', the 'simplest *(unterste)* unit', which was itself no longer further divisible or decomposable.[13] Psychology, however, also studied the individual's behaviour. What then was the difference between the psychological and the sociological approaches?

Sociology, Weber said, examined the behaviour of the individual only in so far as the latter invested his actions with a definite sense. Only such behaviour could interest the sociologist; as for the psychologist, this element was not determinant for him. Weber introduced the sociological concept of action *(Handeln)* through the concept of sense or meaning. "In 'action' [he wrote] is included all human behaviour when and in so far as the acting individual attaches a subjective meaning to it."[14]

It is important to note that he had in mind the sense that the individual invested his behaviour with; he repeatedly stressed that it was not a matter of a 'metaphysical' sense regarded as some 'higher', 'truer' meaning (sociology, according to him, did not deal with metaphysical realities and was not a normative

science) nor of an 'objective' sense that the individual's actions could ultimately acquire independently of his intentions. By that Weber did not, of course, deny either the possibility of there being normative disciplines or the possibility of a 'divergence' between the subjectively implied sense of an individual action and its certain objective sense. In the latter case, however, he preferred not to use 'sense', since it presupposed a subject for which it existed. He only claimed that the object of sociological research was an action associated with a subjectively implied meaning. Sociology, according to him, should be 'understanding' or 'interpretive' in so far as the individual's action was intelligent. But this understanding was not psychological since the sense did not belong to the sphere of psychology and was not the subject-matter of psychology.

One of the central methodological categories of Weber's sociology—that of social action—was linked with the principle of 'understanding'. How important this category was for him can be judged from his defining sociology as the science that studied social action.

How did Weber himself define social action?

> In 'action' is included all human behaviour when and in so far as the acting individual attaches a subjective meaning to it. Action in this sense may be either overt or purely inward and subjective; ... Action is social in so far as, by virtue of the subjective meaning attached to it by the acting individual (or individuals), it takes account of the behaviour of others and is thereby oriented in its course.[15]

A social action thus presupposed two aspects, according to Weber; the subjective *motivation* of the individual or group, without which one could not in general speak of *action,* and an orientation on another person or persons, which Weber called 'expectation' and without which the action could not be regarded as *social.*

Let us dwell, to begin with, on the first aspect. Weber insisted that sociology could not establish the causal connections that ultimately made it possible to draw an objective picture of the social process, without allowing for the motives of the actor. It is interesting to compare Parsons's similar argument.[16]

The category of social action, which requires an understanding of the motives of the individual, is the decisive point on which Weber's sociological approach differs from Durkheim's sociology. By introducing the concept of social action Weber in essence gave an interpretation of social fact directed polemically against what Durkheim proposed. In opposition to Durkheim he considered that neither society as a whole nor any forms of collectivity should be treated (if one were to approach the matter really scientifically) as subjects of action; the latter could only be separate individuals.

> For still other cognitive purposes as, for instance, juristic, or for practical ends, it may on the other hand be convenient or even indispensable to treat social collectivities, such as states, associations, business corporations, foundations, as if they were individual persons. Thus they may be treated as the subjects of rights and duties or as the performers of legally significant actions. But for the subjective interpretation of action in sociological work these collectivities must be treated as *solely* the resultants and modes of organization of particular sets of individual persons, since these alone can be treated as agents in a course of subjectively understandable action.[17]

According to Weber, sociology could treat collectives as resultants of the individuals composing them; they were not independent realities, as with Durkheim, but rather modes of the organization of the actions of separate individuals.

Weber did not rule out the possibility of employing such concepts in sociology as family, nation, state, and army, which the sociologist could not in fact get along without. But he demanded that one should not forget that these forms of collectivity were not really *subjects of social action,* and that one could not, therefore, ascribe will and thought to them, and could not have recourse to the concepts of collective will or collective thought except in a metaphorical sense.[18] It was difficult for Weber, one must note, to be consistent in his 'methodological individualism'; a number of complications arose for him when he tried to apply the category of social action, especially when analysing traditional society.

Understanding of the motivation, of 'the subjectively implied

sense', was thus a necessary element of sociological research. What, however, was 'understanding' when Weber did not identify it with its interpretation by psychology?

According to him the psychological understanding of other people's mental states was only a subsidiary means, and not the main one for a historian or a sociologist. They could only resort to it when the sense of the action being explained could not be understood.

> In explaining the irrationalities of action sociologically, that form of psychology which employs the method of subjective understanding *(verstehende Psychologie)* undoubtedly can make decisively important contributions. But this does not alter the fundamental methodological situation.[19]

What were these methodological principles? Action oriented subjectively quite rationally in accordance with means considered (subjectively) to be unambiguously adequate to achieve (subjectively) unambiguous and clearly realisable ends, he said, was directly most understandable in its sense structure.[20]

Let us analyse this definition. Sociology should thus be oriented on the action of an individual or group of individuals. An intelligible action was the most 'understandable' for that, i.e., one (1) directed to attaining goals clearly realisable by the actor himself, and (2) which employed means to attain those ends recognised as adequate by the actor himself. *His awareness was thus necessary for the action studied to figure as social reality.* Weber called this type of action purposeful or goal-oriented rational (*zweckrational*). There was no need (according to him) to resort to psychology in order to understand it. The more behaviour was oriented in accordance with legitimately oriented rationality (*Richtigkeitsrationalität*)[21], he said, the less necessary it was to explain its course by psychological considerations of some sort.[22]

Intelligent goal-oriented rational action was not the subject-matter of psychology precisely because the goal the individual set himself could not be understood simply by starting from an analysis of his mental life. Examination of this goal took us beyond the limits of psychologism. The link between the goal and the means chosen by the individual to realise it were medi-

ated, of course, by the individual's psychology, but (according to Weber) the more nearly the action was goal-oriented the lower was the coefficient of psychological refraction, and the purer' and more rational the link was between goal and means.

That did not mean, of course, that he regarded a goal-oriented rational action as some kind of universal type of action; on the contrary, he not only did not consider it universal but did not even consider it predominant in empirical reality. It was an ideal type, not an empirically general, let alone universal one. It was seldom met in pure forms in reality as an ideal type. Goal-oriented rational action was the most important type of social action; it served as the model with which all other forms of social action were compared. Weber listed these in the following order: (1) that which more or less approximated to the attained correct type (*Richtigkeitstypus*); (2) the (subjective) goal-oriented rational type; (3) the more or less conscious or apparent, and more or less well-defined goal-oriented rational action; (4) that which was not goal-oriented rational but was similarly understandable in an analogous context; (5) that which was more or less similarly motivated in its sense but more or less strongly distorted by the invasion of incomprehensible elements; and, finally, (6) that in which quite unintelligible psychic or physical facts were linked 'with' and 'in' a person through imperceptible transitions.[23]

This scale was constructed, clearly, on the principle of comparing any action of the individual with a goal-oriented (or legitimately oriented) rational action. The goal-oriented rational action was the most understandable—its degree of obviousness was maximum. As an action became less rational, and less and less understandable, its direct obviousness became less and less. And although the boundary line separating a goal-oriented rational action from the irrational could never be established hard and fast in reality, and although a very considerable part of all sociologically relevant behaviour, especially purely traditional behaviour, is marginal between the two,[24] the sociologist should start from goal-oriented rational action as an ideal-type one, treating other types of human behaviour as deviations from the ideal type.

There is thus understanding in pure form, according to Weber, where we are faced with a goal-oriented rational action.

He himself considered that it was impossible, in this case, to speak of psychological understanding, since the sense of the action and its goal lay beyond the realm of psychology. But let us ask a different question. What exactly do we understand in the case of a goal-oriented rational action? *The sense of the action or of the actor himself?* Assume that we see a person cutting wood in a forest. We can conclude that he is doing it either for pay or in order to lay in fuel for himself for the winter, and so on. Arguing in that way we try to understand the sense of the action and not of the person. But the operation itself might also serve us as a means of analysing the person himself. The difficulty that arises here is very material. For if sociology endeavours to understand the person who acts, then any action figures for it as a sign of something, in reality quite different, that the individual himself does not guess or tries to hide (from others or even himself). Such was the approach to understanding the action of the individual of, for example, Freud's psychoanalysis.

Weber did not rule out the possibility of such an approach in principle. The whole, essential part of *Verstehen* psychology consisted, according to him, just in bringing out the not adequately observed or unobserved connections (and in that sense not rationally oriented ones), which nevertheless turned out to be actually objectively 'rationally' understandable connections in their aim. Leaving out of account that part of the work of 'so-called psychoanalysis', a construction like Nietzsche's theory of resentment, for instance, led to objective rationality of outward behaviour, proceeding from certain interests. That had been done methodologically, incidentally, decades earlier by the theory of economic materialism.[25] Weber clearly did not rule out such an approach to the examination of social phenomena but considered it necessary to point out its problematic nature and therefore the need to limit it and to employ it only sporadically as a subsidiary means. He saw its problematic nature in the goal-oriented and legitimately-oriented rational's not being clearly related to one another subjectively. Weber had in mind the following very serious complication that arose with a 'psychological' approach. When the individual himself was clearly aware of the goal he set himself, and only tried to hide it from others, that was readily understandable; such a situation

could fit fully into the scheme of goal-oriented rational behaviour. But when it was a matter of an action in which the individual did not realise his own aims (and it was just such actions that psychoanalysis investigated) then the question arose whether the investigator had sufficient grounds to claim that he understood the acting person better than the latter understood himself. In fact one should not, after all, forget that the method of psychoanalysis arose from the practice of treating the mentally ill, in respect of whom the doctor considered himself to understand their condition better than they themselves did. For he was a healthy person, and they were sick. But on what grounds could he apply this method to other healthy people? There could only be one basis for that, namely a conviction that they, too, were 'ill'. But the concept of 'illness' was then transferred from the sphere of medicine to the general social one, to the treatment of society as a whole.

It is obviously just such considerations that compelled Weber to limit the sphere of application of that sort of approach to social and historical research. But then how, after all, did he himself answer the question of understanding? What precisely did we understand in the case of a goal-oriented rational action? The sense of the action? Or of the acting person himself? Weber therefore chose as the ideal-type model a goal-oriented rational action in which both these elements *coincided*; to understand the sense of the action meant in that case to understand the person's meaning, while to understand him meant to understand the sense of his act. Weber considered that coincidence the ideal case from which sociology should start. These two elements actually did not usually coincide, but science could not, according to Weber, start from the empirical fact: it had to create an idealised space for itself, and that 'space', for sociology, was the goal-oriented rational action.

The Goal-Oriented Rational Action as a Methodological Category of Weber's Sociology

Since, however, Weber considered a goal-oriented rational action an ideal type, he rightly declared that the 'rationalistic' character of his method did not presuppose a rationalistic

treatment of social reality itself. Goal-oriented rationality was only a methodological precept of sociology, according to him, and not an 'ontological' one; it was a means of analysing reality, but not a characteristic of that reality itself. He specially stressed this element.

Although he took care to differentiate the goal-oriented rational action as a constructed ideal type from empirical reality, yet the problem of the relation of an ideal-type construct and empirical reality was far from as simple as might have been thought, and Weber himself did not have an unambiguous answer. However much he wanted to divide these two spheres once and for all, the sharpness of the division disappeared at the very first attempt to work with ideal-type constructs. We have already seen, in general form, the difficulty that arose here for him.

What premisses important for sociological theory did a goal-oriented rational action contain? By selecting it as a methodological basis for sociology Weber dissociated himself from those sociological theories that took social 'totalities' as their initial reality, i.e., 'people', 'society', 'state', 'economy'. In that connection he sharply criticised 'organic sociology', which regarded the individual as a part, a 'cell', of some social organism. He resolutely objected to treating society on a biological model; the concept of organism could only be a metaphor in regard to society, and no more.

> For other cognitive purposes it may be convenient or necessary to consider the individual, for instance, as a collection of cells, as a complex of biochemical reactions, or to conceive his 'psychic' life as made up of a variety of different elements, however these may be defined... For sociology in the present sense, and for history, the object of cognition is the subjective meaning-complex of action.[26]

The organistic approach to study of society abstracted itself from the fact that man is a being who acts *consciously*. The analogy between the individual and the cell of a body (or an organ) was only possible on condition that the *factor of consciousness was recognised as non-essential*. Weber objected to that, putting forward a model of social action that accepted this factor as essential. And since he declared it to be a neces-

sary premisse of sociology, he started in his researches from the individual rather than the social 'whole'. 'Action in the sense of a *subjectively understandable orientation* of behaviour exists only as the behaviour of one or more individual human beings' [italics added].[27]

The principle of 'understanding' was thus a criterion for separating the sphere relevant for sociology from what could not be the subject-matter of sociological study. We understand the behaviour of the individual, but not the behaviour of a cell. We also do not 'understand' (in Weber's sense of the term) the 'action' of a nation or of the national economy, although we can fully understand the action of the individuals who make up a nation (or who are involved in the economy). That is why Weber said that

> such concepts as 'state', 'association', 'feudalism', and the like, designate certain categories of human interaction. Hence it is the task of sociology to reduce these concepts to 'understandable' action, that is, without exception, to the actions of participating individual men.[28]

Such an approach was obligatory for sociology, according to him, but was not for all the sciences of man in general. Jurisprudence, for example, could regard the state or some collective, in certain circumstances, as a 'legal person', but sociology had no right to do so. Its approach presupposed treating even such social formations as law only in the form in which they were refracted through the goal-oriented rational action (and so through the consciousness) of a separate individual. In so far as 'law' became the object of investigation by sociology, the latter was not dealing with the mediation of the logically correct 'objective' content of legal principles, but was concerned with the action of the individual among determinants and results of which the person's ideas of the 'sense' and 'meaning' of certain legal principles played a significant role.[29]

Sociology should thus study social institutions (law, the state, religion, etc.), according to Weber, in the form in which they became significant for separate individuals, to which the latter were really oriented in their actions. But that meant that the stigma of 'metaphysics' always present in social doctrines that took these institutions as their starting point (as a 'whole-

P-1147

ness' in general) was removed. This stigma was inevitably felt in social theories created from the methodological premisses of realism in the mediaeval sense. To that point of view Weber counterposed a requirement of starting in sociology from the actions of separate individuals. His position could be characterised on those grounds as nominalist, but that would not be a wholly adequate description. He posed the requirement of starting from the individual action as a principle of knowledge and understanding, and because of his neo-Kantian orientation the characteristic of the principles of knowledge was by no means at the same time one of social reality itself. Reality was plastic in the sense that it could also be studied in other ways, whose results could be a science different from sociology, for example, jurisprudence or political economy. Consequently, Weber did not claim, when speaking of an individual goal-oriented rational action that it was a characteristic of the reality of social life itself; he employed it as an ideal type seldom encountered in pure form in reality. It would therefore be best to speak of Weber's methodological nominalism, or rather his methodological individualism.

But methodological individualism, of course, has its ontological implications. By postulating goal-oriented rational action as his starting point, Weber opposed treating consciousness as an epiphenomenon.[30] His basic methodological starting point could be formulated as follows: a person knows himself what he wants. In reality, of course, he by no means always knows what he wants, for a goal-oriented rational action is an ideal case. But the sociologist should start precisely from this ideal case as a theoretical-methodological premisse.

Allowing for the ontological implications we noted above, which are presupposed by the methods concept of social action, one can conclude that Weber's methodological principles were closely linked with his understanding of history. For him social life was the interaction of individual people, and although he himself constantly stressed the exceptional methodological importance of his ideal-type constructs, we must nevertheless state that his methodological individualism was inextricably bound up with the individualism of his outlook and with his treatment of society as the interaction of individuals, i.e., with sociological nominalism.

6. Social Action and 'Orientation to Another' —'Expectation'

Weber considered orientation of the acting person to another individual (or other individuals) as the second obligatory element of social action. Explaining precisely what orientation was involved here, he wrote:

> Social action, which includes both failure to act and passive acquiescence, may be oriented to the past, present, or expected future behaviour of others. Thus it may be oriented by revenge for a past attack, defence against present, or measures of defence against future aggression. The 'others' may be individual persons, and may be known to the actor as such, or may constitute an indefinite plurality and may be entirely unknown as individuals. Thus 'money' is a means of exchange which the actor accepts in payment because he orients his action to the expectation that a large but unknown number of individuals he is personally unacquainted with will be ready to accept it in exchange on some future occasion.[31]

The introduction of the concept 'orientation to another' into sociology was an attempt to find something universal within methodological individualism and by means of it, and to pay attention to the substance of the social (if one can so express it), without which goal-oriented rational action remains a classical example of Crusoism. The authors of 'Crusoades' (or 'Robinsonades', as Marx called them) did not envisage any 'orientation to another' in the actions of individuals; for them the action of the individual rested on individual 'interest' (it was no accident that it was Robinson Crusoe that served as a model of *'Homo oekonomicus'*). Sociology begins, according to Weber, where it is found that economic man is too simplified a model of human being.

But the question can arise here of why Weber needed such a roundabout way to come to recognition of the existence of the 'universal'. The point is that only in this way could he show in what form the 'universal' operated for sociology. It should not treat 'sociality' *apart from and outside* individuals; there should not be even a shadow of *substantiation* of the social. The 'universal' existed only to the extent that and in so far as it was

recognised by separate individuals, and orientated their real behaviour. Weber explained that the existence of such collectivities as 'state' or 'union' meant nothing else, from the standpoint of sociology, than a greater or less chance of the individual's taking them into account in his actions. When this chance was reduced, the existence of a given institution became more problematic; reduction of this chance to nought meant the end of a given institution (state, legal, etc.).

Weber's category of 'orientation to the others' undoubtedly owed its origin to the field of law and was a sociological interpretation of 'admission' or 'confession'– a key concept of jurisprudence and the philosophy of law.

The sociology of law was thus not only one of the special sections of Weber's sociology: he explained 'admission', which constituted a very important principle of jurisprudence, as a constituent element of any social action in general.

The problem of the forms of dominance in Weber's theory acquires particular importance; it comes out in the form of the question of the 'legitimacy of power' and in general of the problem of 'legitimacy'. But one must note that the problem of 'legitimacy' and correspondingly 'recognition', did not get an unambiguous and consistent solution. It was always closely linked, both in jurisprudence and in social philosophy, with the idea of 'natural law'. As for Weber, he considered 'natural law' a value postulate that had no place in sociology, since the latter aimed to be an empirical science and so should be free of values. The task of the theoretical substantiation of categories like 'expectation', 'recognition', and 'legitimacy' remained in the end unsolved.[32]

The existence of a subjective sense and orientation to others were thus two necessary attributes of social action. Not every action, as Weber stressed, could be called social in accordance with that definition. If an individual's action was oriented, for instance, to expectation of a certain 'behaviour' from a material object (machine, natural phenomenon, etc.), rather than from other individuals, it could not be called social in the sense accepted by Weber. In the same way the religious action of an individual who gave himself up to contemplation, solitary prayer, etc., was not a social action. The economic activity of an individual only became a social action when attention was paid

to another individual (or individuals) during the distribution or disposal of certain economic goods, and the action was oriented to them. The action of many individuals could not be considered social, for example, if it was determined by the character and content of an orientation to some natural phenomenon.

Weber did not consider the purely imitative action performed by an individual as an atom of the mass or crowd, described in particular by Gustave Le Bon, to be social; he considered it the subject of study of 'mass psychology and not of sociology, although the latter could, according to him, treat the actions of many persons, and not just of one individual, but it did so on the model of the individual, bringing out the subjectively intended meaning of the actions of the individuals making up the collective, and their mutual orientation to each other and to a 'third'.

As a historian and a sociologist Weber, of course, understood that mass actions were an important object of study by the sociologist, but his specific angle presupposed allowance (according to Weber for the sense relation between the behaviour of the individual and the fact of his becoming part of the mass, i.e., more simply, the sociologist had to understand what subjectively intended sense linked the individual with others, and on what basis people were united in a mass. An action whose course had been affected by the simple fact of mass purely as such, and had only been reactively determined by that fact, was not a 'social action' in the sense developed here.

Weber claimed, consequently, that as soon as the individual who was an 'atom' of the mass realised his being part of the mass, a gap appeared between him and his 'belonging to the mass'; that circumstance would also be determinant for the structure of the mass itself. Weber's sociological approach to mass movements differed essentially on this point from the socio-psychological one proposed, in particular, by Le Bon. The latter approached the phenomenon of the mass or crowd as a *psychologist*. He tried to single out what was general in *any* crowd, be it a revolutionary mass on the streets of Paris, or a pack of Roman soldiers, a throng of spectators in a theatre, or a host of crusaders. In fact a certain community of behaviour could be observed in any 'crowd', whatever the social composition of the individuals making it up, and whatever their intel-

lectual level; what a crowd had in common with any other crowd would be that in its behaviour which was determined purely actively and spontaneously. But what distinguished one type of crowd from another and what should be studied, according to Weber, by the sociology of the crowd, rather than by its psychology, did not come within the purview of social psychology. The object of sociology on that point should be not so much the *direct behaviour* of the mass as its *meaningful result.* The character of a mass movement, largely determined by the sense orientations that guided the individuals constituting the mass, affected (with greater or less deviations) the character of the religious, political, economic and other institutions that were built up during these movements, and as a result of them. Weber tried to realise his method of analysis of mass movements in the sociology of religion, law, and politics.

7. Types of Social Action

By examining Weber's differentiation of types of action we can understand how the 'ideal model' of goal-oriented rational action was applied. He indicated four types of action: goal-oriented rational (*zweckrational*), value-oriented rational *(wertrational)*, affectual, and traditional.

> Social action [he wrote], like other modes of action, may be classified in the following four types according to mode of orientation: (1) in terms of rational orientation to a system of descrete individual ends *(zweckrational)*, that is, through expectations as to the behaviour of objects in the external situation and of other human individuals, making use of these expectations as 'conditions' or 'means' for the successful attainment of the actor's own rationally chosen ends; (2) in terms of rational orientation to an absolute value *(wertrational)*, involving a conscious belief in the absolute value of some ethical, aesthetic, religious, or other form of behaviour, entirely for its own sake and independently of any prospects of external success; (3) in terms of affectual orientation, especially emotional, determined by the specific affects and states of feeling of the actor; (4) traditionally oriented, through the habituation of long practice.[33]

One must immediately draw attention to the point that the last two types of action – affectual and traditional–are not social actions in the proper sense, since we are not dealing here with a conscious meaning or sense. Weber himself remarked that

> strictly traditional behaviour, like the reactive type of imitation discussed above, lies very close to the borderline of what can justifiably be called meaningfully oriented action. For it is very often a matter of almost automatic reaction to habitual stimuli which guide behaviour in a course which has been repeatedly followed.[34]

Only value-oriented and goal-oriented rational actions are social actions in Weber's meaning of the term.

> Examples of pure rational orientation to absolute values [he wrote] would be the action of persons who, regardless of possible cost to themselves, act to put into practice their convictions of what seems to them to be required by duty, honour, the pursuit of beauty, a religious call, personal loyalty, or the importance of some 'cause' no matter in what it consists. ... When action is oriented ... to fulfilment of such unconditional demands ... it will be described as oriented to absolute values.[35]

In the case of value-oriented rational and affectual actions the aim of the action is itself and not something else (result, success, etc.); the secondary consequences (side-effects) in both cases are not taken into account.

Unlike value-oriented rational action, the last, fourth type – goal-oriented rational action– is amenable to subdivision in all respects.

> Action is rationally oriented [Weber considered] to a system of discrete individual needs (*zweckrational*) when the end, the means, and the secondary results are all rationally taken into account and weighed. This involves rational consideration of alternative means to the end, of the relations of the end to other prospective results

of employment of any given means, and finally of the relative importance of different possible ends.[36]

As will be seen, these four types of action were listed by Weber in order of increasing rationality: whereas traditional and affectual actions could be called subjectively irrational (objectively both could be rational), a value-oriented rational action already contained a subjectively rational element, since the actor consciously related his act to a definite value as goal; but this type of action was only relatively rational, since the value itself was taken without further mediation and substantiation and no attention was paid in the result to the side-effects of the act. Only a goal-oriented rational action was absolutely rational in the sense established by Weber, when it occurred in pure form.

An individual's actually performed conduct, Weber said, was oriented, as a rule, in accordance with two or more forms of action; there were goal-oriented and value-oriented rational elements in it, and also affectual and traditional ones. One or other of these forms of action could be predominant in different types of society; traditional and affectual types of orientation predominated in traditional societies, and goal- and value-oriented rational activity in an industrial society, with a tendency toward the former type's ousting of the latter.

In introducing the category of social action Weber could not, however, resolve the difficulties that arose in connection with its application. These were (1) the difficulty of defining the subjectively implied sense of the action. In trying to define more exactly what 'sense' was implied here, Weber tired himself out for years developing the category of sociological 'understanding' but never managed to rid himself fully of psychologism.[37]

(2) The category of social action, as the initial 'cell' of social life, did not make it possible to understand the results of social processes that did not entirely coincide with the direction of individual actions. Since Weber broke the social whole down into its individual psychological components, and treated each of them separately, unconnected with the whole, he was unable to reconstruct the general historical perspective.

8. Formal Rationality as a Category of Weber's Sociology

It was not fortuitous that Weber put the four types of social action he described in order of increasing rationality; that order was not simply a methodological technique convenient for explanation; he was convinced that rationalisation of social action was the trend of history itself. And although history did not happen without 'impediments' and 'deviations', the European history of recent centuries and the 'drawing' of other, non-European civilisations onto the road of the industrialisation taking place in the West, were evidence, according to him, that rationalisation was a universal historical process.

> One of the most important aspects of the process of 'rationalization' of action [he wrote] is the substitutions for the unthinking acceptance of ancient custom, of deliberate adaptation to situations in terms of self-interest. To be sure, this process by no means exhausts the concept of rationalization of action. For in addition this can proceed in a variety of other directions; positively in that of a conscious rationalization of ultimate values; and, finally, in favour of a morally sceptical type of rationality, at the expense of any belief in absolute values.[38]

What did the growing role of goal-oriented rational action mean from the standpoint of society as a whole? The ways of running the economy was rationalised; management was rationalised—both in the economy and in politics, science, and culture, i.e., in all spheres of public affairs; people's way of thinking was rationalised, and likewise their way of feeling and way of life as a whole. All that was accompanied with growth of the social role of science, which was, according to Weber, the purest embodiment of the principle of rationalisation. Science first penetrated production (industry) and then management, and finally everyday life as well; and Weber saw evidence in that of the universal rationalisation of modern society.

Rationalisation, according to him, was the result of uniting a number of historical factors that had predetermined the development of Europe over the past 300 or 400 years. He did not examine this constellation of factors as something previously

predetermined; it was rather a kind of historical accident, so that rationalisation, from his point of view, was not so much a necessity of historical development as its fate and destiny. It happened because, at a certain time, and in a certain area of the world, several phenomena were encountered that included a rational principle; the science of antiquity, particularly mathematics, supplemented during the Renaissance by experiment, which acquired the character (from the time of Galileo) of a new experimental science internally linked with technique; rational Roman law, which the previous types of society had not known, and which was developed further on European soil in the Middle Ages; the rational mode of running the economy that had arisen through the separation of labour from the means of production, on the soil of what Marx had called 'abstract labour', i.e., labour amenable to quantitative measurement. The factor that made it possible to synthesise, as it were, all these elements was, according to Weber, Protestantism, which created the ideological preconditions for realising a rational mode of carrying on business (primarily through introduction of the advances of science into the economy and their transformation into a productive force), since economic success was elevated to a religious calling by the Protestant ethic.

A new type of society that had never existed before arose as a result for the first time in Europe, and therefore had no analogy, the society that present-day sociologists call industrial. Weber called all previously existing types of society traditional, in contrast to modern. Their most important attribute was that the formal rational principle was not dominant in them. What was this principle?

Formal rationality was primarily calculability, and the formally rational was that which was amenable to quantitative calculation, which exhausted the quantitative characteristic without a remainder.

> The term 'formal rationality of economic action' will be used to designate the extent of quantitative calculation on accounting which is technically possible and which is actually applied. The 'substantive rationality', on the other hand, is the degree to which a given group of persons, no matter how it is delimited, is or could be adequately provided with goods by means of an economically oriented

> course of social action. This course of action will be interpreted in terms of a given set of ultimate values no matter what they may be.[39]

In other words, an economy guided by certain criteria that lay outside what could be calculated, and which Weber called 'substantive postulates', i.e., an economy that served ends not determined by itself, was characterised as 'materially (substantively) determined'. 'Substantive' rationality was rationality for *something;* formal rationality was rationality *'not for something',* rationality in itself, taken as an end in itself. But it should not be forgotten that the concept of formal rationality was an ideal type, and was very seldom encountered in pure form in empirical reality. Yet the movement toward formal rationality, as Weber showed in many of his works, was a movement of history itself. 'Substantive rationality' had prevailed in previous types of society, but in modern society it was formal rationality, which corresponded to predominance of the goal-directed rational type of activity over all others.

Weber was not original in his theory of formal rationality and about the difference of the modern type of society from traditional ones in precisely this respect; what he designated as formal rationality had been discovered by Marx, and figured in his works as the concept 'abstract labour'.[40] The concept played a different role in the structure of Marx's thought from Weber's formal rationality, but there is no doubt of Marx's influence on him on this point.[41] For Marx the most important indicator of abstract labour was that it 'has no particular quality and can thus be measured only in terms of quantity'.[42] A purely quantitative characteristic of labour had become possible, according to him, only in capitalist society, which created 'the bourgeois form of labour as distinct from its antique and mediaeval forms'.[43] The peculiarity of this labour was above all its abstract universality, i.e., its indifference as regards the definite form of the product it created, and so in regard to what needs its product satisfied. Marx's definition of abstract, universal labour recorded the fact of the transformation of labour into a means of creating wealth in general. Man and his needs thus became, as he showed, only a means, an element, needed for the normal course of production.

The most essential characteristic of Weber's formal rationality was similar, as Karl Löwith has stressed, and was that the mode of management had become so independent that it no longer had any manifest relation to human needs as such.[44] Formal rationality was a principle to which not only the modern economy was subordinated but also, in tendency, the whole aggregate of the vital directions of modern society.

The theory of formal rationality was, in essence, Weber's theory of capitalism. It is necessary to note the close link between his methodology, in particular the theory of social action, and the distinguishing of types of action, on the one hand, and his theory of the genesis of capitalism, on the other. In fact he stressed that when the investigator created an ideal-type construct, he was guided in the last analysis by the 'interest of the age', which set the 'direction of view' for him. The age set Weber, as the central problem, what modern capitalist society was, what were its origin and path of development, what was the lot of the individual in that society, and how it realised, or would realise in the future, the ideals that had been proclaimed by its ideologists in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries as the 'ideals of reason'. The character of the question predetermined Weber's set of methodological techniques. The type of 'social action' was created, in particular that of goal-oriented rational action, which served as the reference point for constructing other types of action. Characteristically, Weber himself considered the behaviour of the individual in the economic sphere to be the purest empirical example of goal-oriented rational action. And it was not fortuitous that he cited examples of goal-oriented rational action, as a rule, from it: either the exchange of goods, or competitive struggle on the market, or playing the stock exchange, etc. Correspondingly, when traditional societies were referred to he remarked that the goal-oriented rational type of action was met in them mainly in the economic sphere.

The problem of the fate of capitalism thus conditioned Weber's 'methodological individualism'. So he had a quite definite social stance, coming forward in his sociology as an exponent of the ideology and interests of the capitalist class.

9. Weber's Theory of Types of Domination

Weber's theory of 'rationalisation' was very closely linked with his understanding of social action. His sociology of authority was no less closely linked with the category of social action. He considered 'orientation to another' an inseparable element of social action, and as nothing other than the category of 'recognition' traditional for jurisprudence. When this category was freed of the normative significance it had in jurisprudence, and of the 'metaphysical' meaning it had in theories of 'natural law', we got precisely the concept of 'expectation' that Weber thought necessary for sociological study of society. This concept was very important in his theory of types of legitimate domination, i.e., of the domination *recognised* by the governed individuals. His definition of domination was characteristic: the chance to get obedience for a definite order or command.[45] It thus presupposed a mutual expectation: by him who ordered that his command would be carried out, and by those who obeyed that the command would have the character which they expected, i.e., recognised. Weber began his analysis of legitimate types of domination, in full accordance with his methodology, with an examination of possible (typical) 'motives of obedience'.[46] He found three of such motives and accordingly distinguished three pure types of domination.

Domination (*Herrschaft*) could be governed by interests, i.e., goal-directed rational considerations of the obeying persons about its advantages or disadvantages; it could be governed, furthermore, by simple 'usage' and a habit of certain obedience; and finally it could be based on the simple personal disposition of the dominated, i.e., could be really affectively based on the simple, personal disposition of the governed.[47]

The first type of domination (Weber called it 'legal') thus had a sense of interest as 'a motive of compliance'; it was based on a goal-directed rational action. He classed the modern capitalist countries (Great Britain, France, the United States, etc.) in this type. In them, he stressed, there was subordination not to an individual personality but to established laws, and not only the governed were subordinated to them but also the governors (officials). The apparatus of administration consisted of specially trained officials who were required to act 'without

respect of persons', i.e., according to strictly formal, rational rules. The formal, legal principle was the one underlying 'legal domination'; and it was this principle, according to him, that was one of the necessary preconditions of the development of modern capitalism as a system of formal rationality.

Bureaucracy, Weber said, was technically the purest type of legal domination, but no domination could be only bureaucratic. At the top of the ladder stood either a hereditary monarch, or a president elected by the people, or leaders elected by a parliamentary corporation, he wrote.[48] But the everyday, continuous work was carried on by specialist officials, i.e., by an administrative machine, whose activity could not be stopped without causing a serious breakdown in the functioning of the social machinery.

The official who corresponded to the 'rational' type of state, had to have a special education, in addition to legal training, since competence was required of him. Here is how Weber described the pure type of rational bureaucratic administration:

> The whole administrative staff under the supreme authority then consists, in the purest type, of individual officials who are appointed and function according to the following criteria:
>
> (1) They are personally free and subject to authority only with respect to their impersonal official obligations.
>
> (2) They are organized in a clearly defined hierarchy of offices.
>
> (3) Each office has a clearly defined sphere of competence in the legal sense.
>
> (4) The office is filled by a free contractual relationship. Thus, in principle, there is free selection.
>
> (5) Candidates are selected on the basis of technical qualifications... They are *appointed,* not elected.
>
> (6) They are remunerated by fixed salaries in money, for the most part with a right to pensions...
>
> (7) The office is treated as the sole, or at least the primary, occupation of the incumbent.
>
> (8) It constitutes a career. There is a system of 'promotion' according to seniority or to achievement, or both. Promotion is dependent on the judgment of superiors.
>
> (9) The official works entirely separated from ownership of the means of administration and without appropriation of his position.

(10) He is subject to strict and systematic discipline and control in the conduct of the office.[49]

This type of domination corresponded most closely, according to him, to the formal, rational structure of the economy that had become established in Western Europe and the USA at the end of the nineteenth century; there was the same specialisation and division of labour as in industry; the official was 'separated from the means of administration' just like the producer from the means of production. 'Bureaucratic administration means fundamentally the exercise of control on the basis of knowledge. This is the feature of it which makes it specially rational.'[50]

The ideal type of formal, rational administration described by Weber was undoubtedly an idealisation of the real state of affairs; it did not, and does not have an empirical realisation in any modern capitalist state. He essentially had in mind, here, the machinery of administration (machinery in the literal sense); it could not in fact have any interests except 'the good of the office' and it was not prone to corruption. He considered that no machinery in the world could work so punctually and exactly, and as cheaply as this human machine.[51]

But the administrative machine, like any other, needed a programme. And only a political leader (or leaders) who could set it definite aims, could give it a programme, in other words, someone who put the formal machinery of administration at the service of definite political values. The separation of 'science' and 'values' typical of Weber's methodology found another application in his sociology of domination.

The other type of legitimate domination, governed by 'morals, and habituation to a certain obedience', Weber called traditional. Traditional authority was based not only on belief in legality and the rule of law but also on the sanctity of eternally existing order and powers; it was based, consequently, on traditional action. For him its purest form was patriarchalism. The union of the rulers (dominant) was the community (*Gemeinschaft*), the type of the chief was the 'lord', the staff of the administration—the 'servants', the subordinates 'subjects' who served the lord out of piety.[52] He stressed that the patriarchal type of authority was in many respects similar in its structure to the

structure of the family.[53] (It was that circumstance which made this type of legitimacy, which was characteristic of this type of domination, particularly firm and stable.[54])

The administrative apparatus in this type of authority consisted of domestic servants, relatives, and personal friends personally dependent on the lord, or vassals personally sworn to him. In all cases it was personal fidelity that served as the grounds for appointment to an office and for promotion up the hierarchical ladder, and not service discipline or business competence as in the type of domination examined above. Since there were no limits to the will and power of the lord the hierarchical chain was often broken by privileges.

Weber distinguished two forms of traditional domination: purely patriarchal, and an estate structure of administration. In the former the 'servants' were wholly dependent personally on the lord, though people could be drawn into the administration from quite rightless strata of the population, along with close relatives and friends of the lord; that type of traditional authority was met, for example, in Byzantium. In the second type the 'servants' were not personally dependent and their administration was to some extent 'autocephalic' and autonomous; here the principle of noble honour operated, which could not be said of administration under the patriarchal structure. The feudal states of Western Europe were closest to this type. Administration through patrimonial dependents (slaves, serfs), as in Asia Minor, and in Egypt down to the time of the Mamelukes, was an extreme and not always very consistent type of estateless, purely patrimonial authority. Administration through free plebeians was rather closer to rational bureaucracy. Administration through literary men (*Literaten*) could have a different character, but it always approximated to the estate type: Brahmins, mandarins, and Buddhist and Christian clerics.[55]

An absence of formal law, and consequently a requirement to act without respect of persons, was characteristic of the customary types of traditional authority; the character of relations in any sphere was strictly personal; but, as Weber stressed, the sphere of trade enjoyed a certain, though relative, freedom from this purely personal principle in all types of traditional society[56]; there was always a traditional form of trade alongside free trade.

The third pure form of domination for Weber was what he called charismatic authority. The concept of charisma or God's gift (from the Greek *kharisma,* show favour) played an important role in his sociology; charisma, at least in accordance with its etymology, was a kind of extraordinary capacity distinguishing an individual from others and not so much acquired by him (the main point) as given to him (by nature, god, or destiny). Weber counted as charismatic qualities magical power, the gift of prophecy, outstanding force of mind or word; heroes, great generals, magicians, prophets and seers, artists of genius, outstanding politicians, the founders of world religions (Buddha, Jesus, Mohammed), and the founders of states (Solon and Lycurgus), and great conquerors (Alexander the Great, Caesar, and Napoleon) had charisma.[57]

The charismatic type of legitimate domination was the direct opposite of the traditional; whereas the traditional type was supported by habit, attachment to the customary and the once and for all established, the charismatic on the contrary relied on something unusual, something not previously recognised. It was not fortuitous, according to Weber, that the turn of phrase 'It is written ... but I say unto you', was characteristic of the prophet.[58] The affectual type of social action was the main basis of charismatic domination. 'In traditionally stereotyped periods,' he wrote, 'charisma is the greatest revolutionary force'[59], capable of introducing changes in the structure of societies lacking in dynamism.

But, for all the differences and even the opposite nature of the traditional and charismatic types of domination, there was much in common between them, namely that both were based on personal relations between lord and subjects. In that respect both types were opposed to the formal, rational type of domination as impersonal. The source of personal devotion to the charismatic lord was not tradition and not recognition of his formal right, but an emotionally coloured devotion to him, and faith in his charisma. That is why, Weber stressed, the charismatic leader must constantly demonstrate its presence. The union of the dominant people, as in the previous case, was the community, in which the teacher and his disciples, the leader and his followers and supporters, etc., were united in accordance with the character of the charisma. The administrative appa-

1147

ratus constituted on the basis of the presence (in the administrator) of charisma and devotion to the leader; the rational concept of 'competence' and the estate-traditional concept 'privilege' were quite absent here. The charismatic domination differed from both the formal, rational and traditional types in there being no rules in it (either rationally or traditionally established): decisions on all matters were made irrationally, through 'revelation or ... creation, action or example, decision from case to case'[60].

The charismatic principle of legitimacy was authoritarian in contrast to the formal, rational one. The authority of the charismatic leader was based essentially on this force—only not on crude, physical force (which, incidentally, was by no means ruled out), but on the strength of his gift.

One must also note that Weber regarded charisma quite unrelated to the content of what the charismatic person proclaimed, stood for or carried forth true to his principle that sociology as a science should be free of values. He was emphatically indifferent to the values introduced into the world by the charismatic person: Pericles, Cleon, Napoleon, Jesus, or Genghis Khan were identical charismatic leaders from Weber's point of view as a sociologist of authority; the state or religious communities created by them were varieties of the charismatic type of domination.

Weber's methodological principles ruled out the possibility of differentiating the type of politician like Pericles, for example, from the political demagogue of the type of Hitler, who relied on suggestive, emotional forms of influencing the masses and therefore fitted Weber's definition of the charismatic person. Since the sociologist, according to him, should be interested in the objective result of a historical person's actions and not in the subjective difference (real religiosity, say, from pseudoreligiosity), his sociology necessarily involved a certain ambiguity. This ambiguity played a negative role, independently of his own political bias, in the complex socio-political situation that arose in Germany after World War I during the Weimar Republic.

10. The Contradictory Nature of Weber's Political Stance

I have already mentioned that legal domination, for Weber, had a weaker legitimising force than either the traditional or the charismatic. He pinned the legal type of domination on goal-oriented rational action, i.e., on interests.

In its pure form legal domination thus had no value foundation and therefore the formal, rational bureaucracy exercising this type of domination should exclusively serve 'the good of the cause', interests; its impersonal character corresponded to its proposed 'extra-value maxims'.

Weber treated the relations of domination in the 'rational' state on the analogy of those in the sphere of private enterprise (the model of goal-oriented rational action was, after all, economic action). Relations in the economic sphere, according to him, were the 'cell' from which the legal type of domination developed. What was this 'cell'?

The most general precondition of the rational economy of modern capitalism, according to Weber, was the rational calculation of capital as the norm for all big industrial enterprises working to meet everyday needs. It was the possibility of strict accounting, and accounts control of an enterprise's earning power and income by the casting of a balance, which emerged only from a number of preconditions that had earlier not existed, that had opened the way to the development of a 'rational' economy. What were these specific preconditions?

They were (1) the acquisition of free ownership of material means of production (land, instruments, machines, tools, etc.) by autonomous, private industrialists; (2) a free market, i.e., freedom of the market from irrational restraints on exchange, for example by guild restrictions; (3) a rational, i.e., strictly calculated and therefore mechanised technique for both production and exchange; (4) rational, i.e., firmly established law (for the capitalist order to function the rational economy had to be based on firm legal norms for the courts and administration); (5) free labour, i.e., the existence of people who not only had the right to sell their labour power on the market but were economically compelled to do so; (6) a commercial organisation of the economy, by which was understood broad use of securities

to establish rights of participation in enterprises and rights to property, in short, the possibility of an exclusive orientation on covering needs by the market demand and income of the enterprise.

Most of the prerequisites of the capitalist economy listed by Weber had a common element characterised as emancipation: of the market from guild restrictions, of law from coalescence with morals and customs,[61] of the producer from the means of production. It will readily be understood why these preconditions were necessary so that there could be rational accounting of capital; for accounting presupposed the possibility of converting all qualitative characteristics into quantitative ones, and everything that was not amenable to such conversion figured as an obstacle in the way of the development of a rational capitalist economy.

In Weber's understanding of it, rationality was formal, *functional rationality*. Its full development required the rise of the same functional type of administration, i.e., a type free of any meaningful (value) elements. He considered legal domination such a type. But since formal rationality, like the pure type of goal-oriented rational action corresponding to it, was not an end in itself but a means for achieving some other end, legal authority did not have adequate legitimacy and had to be reinforced by something else, either traditions or charisma. When this thesis is translated into political language, it sounds rather as follows: parliamentary democracy, recognised by liberalism as the sole rightful legislative (legitimising) body in the legal type of West European capitalist state, did not have adequate legitimising force in the eyes of the masses, and therefore had to be supplemented either by a hereditary monarch (whose rights, of course, were limited by parliament) or a plebiscitely elected political leader.[62] In the first case the legal domination's legitimacy was strengthened by means of tradition, and in the second by means of charisma. Weber himself came to the conclusion in the last years of his life that it was necessary to supplement parliamentary legitimacy precisely by plebiscitary legitimacy; a politician elected directly by all the people and not by parliament, and having the right to appeal directly to the people over the head of parliament, was needed as a political leader. Only a plebiscite, he claimed, could give this political leader th

legitimacy that would allow him to pursue a definitely oriented policy, i.e., to put the state bureaucratic machinery at the service of certain values.

When we recall that charisma did not, in principle, admit of any meaningful interpretation in Weber's sociology, it is understandable that his political stance looks very ambiguous in the light of the events that took place in Germany 13 years after his death. And while some of the Western students of his work consider that he theoretically forecast the development of totalitarian regimes in Europe and warned against the possibility of them, others are inclined to blame him for having indirectly, theoretically furthered the rise of those regimes.

Weber gave real grounds, in fact, for such evaluations; his political stance, and likewise his theory of domination, were a substantial departure from the position of classical liberalism, represented theoretically in Germany, in particular, by neo-Kantianism. This departure seems to come out most clearly, theoretically, in the treatment of the legal capitalist state as a purely functional formation needing legitimisation by 'values' external to it.

The ambiguity of his stance was linked with his contradictory attitude to the rationalist tradition. On the one hand, he came out as a spokesman of rationalism. That showed both in his methodology, oriented on meaningful, subjectively motivated individual action, and in his political views; from the 1890s his political articles and speeches were aimed against the agrarian conservatism and ideology of the German Junkers to whom he opposed a bourgeois-liberal position. His critique of the romantic irrationalism of the life philosophy fully corresponded to his critique of the conservative Junkers in politics; and to his rationalism in methodology there corresponded a conscious defence of rationality as the main principle of capitalist economics.

Weber's value attitude to rationalism as an ethical principle showed particularly clearly in his preference for the 'ethic of responsibility' (*Verantwortungsethik*) and the 'ethic of conviction' (*Gesinnungsethik*). The former, which presupposed a sober estimate of a situation, and a strictly rational formulation of alternative possibilities, and conscious choice and unswerving implementation of one of the possibilities, and also personal

responsibility for that choice, was always the guiding principle of his own activity. He demanded that one be guided precisely by that principle both in science (his ideal types were essentially meant to give a strictly rational formulation of alternative, mutually exclusive possibilities) and in politics; according to him the 'ethics of responsibility' should be an obligatory essential quality of a political leader.

In his polemics against Roscher, Knies, and Mayer, Weber himself pointed out the connection between the concept 'rationality' and freedom—a 'value' most important for him. One was free, according to him, when one's activity was rational, i.e., when one was clearly aware of the aim pursued, and consciously selected means adequate to it. The 'more freely' an actor made a decision, i.e., the more it depended on his own 'considerations' unsullied by any 'outside' compulsion or insurmountable 'affects', the more the motivation was subordinated *ceteris paribus* to the categories of 'end' and 'means', and the fuller its rational analysis would consequently be, and its inclusion, where necessary, in the scheme of rational activity.

He did not, however, completely share the principles of the rationalist tradition. He did not recognise the ontological value of rationalism, but only accepted its methodological significance; his tendency to divide methodology and ontology, on the one hand, and methodology and ideology, on the other, was itself due precisely to his certain distancing of himself from the principle of rationality. This showed on the political plane in his departure from classical liberalism, which came out primarily when he was examining problems of political economy. The latter could not be oriented, he wrote, either to ethical, or to production-technical, or to eudemonist 'ideals'—it could and should be oriented to 'national' ideals, and its goal should be the economic strengthening and prosperity of the nation. The 'nation' also figured with him as the highest political value. His 'nationalism', it is true, did not have the same character as with German conservatives. He did not consider it possible to sacrifice the political freedom of the individual for the sake of the 'nation'; his ideal was a combination of political freedom and national might. A combination of political liberalism and nationalist motives was characteristic in general of Germany, and Weber was perhaps not an exception in that, but he gave the ideas of

'nationalism' a rather different substantiation than nineteenth-century German liberalism.

The same duality was typical of Weber's attitude to formal rationality. The American sociologist Arthur Mitzman tried to show in his *Iron Cage* that Weber's attitude to formal rationality changed substantially during his development. He considered that whereas Weber was an adherent and supporter of rationality in the first period of his work, he subsequently, especially during World War I and afterward, was inclined to be very critical of the principle of rationality, counterposing irrational charisma to it.[63] It seems to me that such a sharp evolution in Weber's work cannot be established, and that Mitzman's approach simplifies the real picture. When we compare such works of Weber's as *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (which belongs to the first period) and *Science as a Calling* (from the last year of his life), one can find in both his ambivalent attitude to the principle of rationality.[64] One can really say there was a change of accent. The mood of 'heroic pessimism' was weaker in the young Weber, and became stronger year by year in his later life.

Weber not only had a dual attitude to rationality, but a no less dual one to its antipode, charisma, and also to 'tradition', the most alien for him. That circumstance always paralysed him as a politician; dualism affected him every time it was a matter of an unambiguous response to some political situation: every way out found today seemed to him tomorrow's blind alley. Those who knew his political temperament were convinced that he preferred the activity of a professional politician to an academic career, but his private tragedy, as Wolfgang Mommsen has justly noted, was that, although he was a born 'doer', his activity was always paralysed by reason.[65]

11. The Sociology of Religion

The very marked ambiguity of Weber's attitude to any ideal type (rationality, charisma, tradition) affected his sociology of religion.

His studies in this field began with his *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism* (1904) and completed by major historical and sociological studies analysing world religions (Hindu-

ism, Buddhism, Confucionism, Taoism, Judaism, etc.). Two stages can be distinguished in his work on problems of religion, differing not only in subject-matter but partly also in the direction of his research interest. In the first stage, when he was working on *The Protestant Ethic,* his interest in religion was limited mainly to matters of what role had been played in the moulding of modern capitalism by the change in the religious ethic due to the rise and development of Protestantism, and more broadly in realisation of the principle of rationality. The object of his study therefore became the connection between religious-ethical principles and forms of economic activity, his polemical feel being directed in it against Marx's conception of religion as a product of economic relations. In essence, however, his polemic had as its object the crude economic substantiation of religion, rather than Marxism, since Marxism has always recognised a feedback of spiritual factors on the economic structure of society.

The theme discussed in *The Protestant Ethic,* viz., the connection and mutual influence of religion and the economy, retained its significance in Weber's later studies of religion as well. One of the main themes in his investigations of world religions was how religious-ethical maxims and precepts influenced the character and mode of realising economic activity, and mainly the forms of its motivation, and how, furthermore, different types of carrying on the economy 'deformed' religious-ethical principles. His main means of analysis was comparison, which was called for by his method of ideal typing. The degree of rationalisation of economic activity permitted by one religious ethic or another, was the primary, albeit not exclusive basis of his comparison. The degree of rationalisation, he showed, was inversely proportional to the strength and force of the magic element present in varying degrees in any religion. The pair of opposites 'the rational—the magic' was one of the tools of analysis in his *Economic Ethic of World Religions.*[66]

As Weber passed from the forming and development of modern capitalism to the creation of sociology as a positive empirical science of society, and as he contemplated the place and role of the religious factor in the structure of a social formation, his sociology of religion pursued another objective, along with its former one. He tried, by means of the sociology of reli-

gion, to disclose the content of the category of social action: the sociology of religion had *subjectively implied meaning* as its own subject-matter. Whereas in the sociology of law and the state he had analysed forms of 'orientation to another', in the sociology of religion he tried to give a typology of the main types of meaning as they figured in history. As a result the sociology of religion became a central section of his sociology as a whole.

Just as it was difficult to separate the elements in a real social action from one another, i.e., 'the subjectively implied meaning' and 'orientation to another', so it was also difficult to separate the religious-ethical and state-legal formations so closely linked with one another in history. But for purposes of analysis Weber deliberately split them apart so as to clarify the 'mechanism' of their connection for himself later during the investigation. It was therefore no longer a matter, in this series of papers, just of the relation of religion and the economy, but also of the relation of religion and the forms of power, religion and art, science, philosophy, etc.

In spite of the broadening and deepening of the theme, however, the methodological means of analysis remained as before; the standard for comparison was the same here as in the other departments of his sociology, i.e., goal-oriented rational action, and its purest version—economic action. Establishing the type of religion's link precisely with the economic ethic was, as before, the most important means of analysis for Weber of both religion itself and of its relation to law, the state, science, art, etc.

He did not make the comparison on the basis of externally fixed elements of religious action; that approach yielded little as regards religious phenomena. Only understanding of the sense of the actions performed, i.e., the motives of the acting individuals, made a sociological analysis of religion possible. Before all the types of religious behaviour were compared and classified, it was necessary to see the object that had to be compared and classified. The role of the method of understanding and cognition was particularly important in the sociology of religion. While the construction of the ideal type brought Weber close to positivism and nominalism, his principle of 'understanding' required, on the contrary, contemplation and 'co-experiencing'

(which gives grounds for comparing his sociology of religion with the phenomenology of Edmund Husserl and others.[67] It was that which permitted Pitirim Sorokin to claim that Weber's sociology of religion was essentially a sociology of culture as a whole. Weber's approach to the study of religion differed from that of the French school (Durkheim, Lévy-Bruhl, and others), on the one hand, and from the English tradition (running from Tylor to Frazer), on the other. Study of the genesis of religion, and of its early forms, was primarily a characteristic of both the French school and the British: it was not by chance that both were attracted to the religious notions of primitive societies and, starting from that, examined the structure of religious consciousness as such. The British ethnographers and students of religion, being guided by the principles of evolutionism, did not think of understanding religion any other way than by establishing its origins. Durkheim, who considered the concepts of religion and sociality to be, generally speaking, identical, analysed the problem of the origin and essence of religion as identical with that of the origin and essence of society; the significance he attached to studies of the sociology of religion is therefore understandable.

While Weber did not make the origin of religion his central problem, he also did not specially study the matter of its essence. As Ernst Cassirer correctly noted, Weber posed the question of the pure 'composition' (*Bestand*) of religion in his sociology, and not either its empirical or even its theoretical origin.[68]

> The external courses of religious behavior are so diverse that an understanding of this behavior can only be achieved from the viewpoint of the subjective experiences, ideas, and purposes of the individuals concerned—in short, from the viewpoint of the religious behavior's 'meaning' (*Sinn*).[69]

Weber was also guided in the study of religion by the requirement of starting from the separate individual and his motives—experiences, notions, aims. It is therefore understandable that, unlike Durkheim, he stressed a quite different element of any religion, including (and even above all) primitive religion, namely magical and cult actions which always, according to him, had a this-world goal. 'The most elementary forms of behavior moti-

vated by religious or magical factors', he wrote, 'are oriented to *this* world',[70] primarily to control the weather (to summon rain, to stop a storm, and so on), to cure illness (including the driving out or exorcising of evil spirits from the sick person's body), the forecasting of future events, etc. It was precisely because a magical and ritual action had as its aim (in Weber's conviction) the achieving of certain quite this-worldly (and in that sense rational) results, that he considered it possible to classify this action as 'relatively rational behavior'.[71]

A second most important aspect of Weber's sociology of religion was his concentration on the role of the individual's unusual, supernatural capabilities thanks to which he could be a magus, shaman, prophet, or founder of a new religion. These capacities (individual charisma) were a vast social force, according to him, but an irrational force that he counterposed to rational factors. He thus treated charisma again as a factor referring to the *individual* and requiring attention to be paid precisely to individual behaviour as the cell of the social process.

Weber also selected the object of study in accordance with his interests and method. He mainly studied the religions of developed societies, i.e., world religions that represented a comparatively high level of social differentiation, considerable intellectual development, the emergence of a personality endowed with clear self-awareness. Although the ritual, cult element had its place in world religions the significance of dogmatic and ethical elements grew in comparison with ceremonial and ritual ones, to the extent and as far as the group principle was weakened in them and the individual singled out. And it was in this that his methodology, which required analysis of the motives of the acting persons, found its appropriate object of study.

Weber established, from vast data on highly developed forms of religious life, where and in what social conditions, and among what social strata and professional and vocational groups the ritual-cult element predominated in religion, where the ascetic-active principle, where the mystic-contemplative, and where the intellectual-dogmatic. Thus, according to him, magical elements were most characteristic of the religions of agricultural peoples, and—within the context of highly developed cultures—of the peasant estate; belief in destiny and fate constituted an attribute of the religion of conquerors and of the military caste; the

religion of urban estates, in particular of craftsmen, had a rational character, these groups depending less than tillers on external, natural conditions, and more on a rhythmically regular, rationally organised labour process. But since world religions arose and spread, as a rule, among more than one estate, a whole number of various elements were present in peculiar combinations in them.

When examining the individual image of world religious-ethical systems, Weber classified them in accordance with the social strata that were precisely their main bearers or vectors: the bearer of Confucianism was the bureaucrat organising the world, of Hinduism the magus regulating the world, of Buddhism the contemplative monk wandering the world, of Islam the warrior conquering the world, of Christianity the itinerant craftsman.

Weber paid special attention to the problem of pariahs, i.e., of groups that were on the lowest rungs, or were even quite outside the social hierarchy. While an orientation of interests to this world, a striving to introduce order into it (Confucianism), or to organise it (Hinduism), to enlighten and sanctify it (elements of this striving to 'sanctify' could be found in the Catholic and Orthodox versions of Christianity), were characteristic of the most privileged, aristocratic strata, as a rule (but not exclusively), eschatological motives, and a striving for 'the other world' figured in the foreground of the 'religions of pariahs'.

Weber showed, when analysing 'the religious ethic of pariahs' from the data of Judaism, especially the religion of the prophets, and also of the various currents and sects within Christianity, that the bearers of the 'religiosity of pariahs' were never slaves or free day-labourers, who were not in general active as regards religion, according to him. He also did not think the proletariat, contemporaneous with him, to be exceptions in that respect.[72] The most active, religiously, among the underprivileged, according to him, were the petty craftsmen and artisans, impoverished sons and daughters from more privileged strata (for example, Russian lower middle-class intellectuals or *raznochintsy*, whose type of world outlook interested him very much). But it should not be thought that eschatologism and an 'otherworld orientation of religious interest' ruled out intellectualism. Weber discussed that theme specially and came to the conclusion that the intellectualism of pariahs and 'folk intellectuals' (for

instance, rabbis) was as common a phenomenon as the intellectualism of the top officials (for example, the Chinese mandarins) or the clergy (in Hinduism or Judaism), and so on.

Weber classified religions, as well, according to their different attitudes to the world. Acceptance of the world was characteristic of Confucianism, for instance, and rejection and non-acceptance of the world of Buddhism. 'Indian religiosity ... is the cradle of those religious ethics which have abnegated the world' in theory and in practice, he wrote.[73] Some religions accepted the world on condition of improving and correcting it: such were Islam, Christianity, and Zoroastrianism. The attitude of religious ethics to the sphere of politics, and in general to authority and coercion, depended on whether and how far the world was accepted. A religion that rejected the world was apolitical, as a rule, and excluded coercion. Buddhism was the most consistent in this respect, although the ideas of non-violence were also characteristic of Christianity. Where the world was completely accepted, religious views were readily coordinated with the realm of politics, Weber noted, and magical religions did not in general come into conflict with politics.

World religions had a soteriological character, as a rule. The problem of salvation was central in the religious ethic. Weber analysed religious-ethical precepts in accordance with what road of salvation they proposed. Two variants were primarily possible: salvation through personal behaviour, as, for example, in Buddhism, and salvation through an intercessor or saviour (Judaism, Islam, Christianity). In the first case the methods of salvation were either ritual cult actions and ceremonies or social actions (love of near ones, philanthropy, care for near ones in Confucianism) or, finally, self-perfection. In the second case (salvation through a saviour) there were also several variations: (1) through institutionalisation (belonging to the Church as a condition of salvation in Catholicism); (2) through faith (Judaism, Lutheranism); (3) through the mercy of predestination (Islam, Calvinism).

Finally, Weber differentiated roads of salvation that no longer depended so much on fulfilment of commandments, and on believers' performance of ritual actions, as on their inner state. Here he also discovered two different types: salvation through positive ethical behaviour and through mystical contemplation.

In the first case the believer was aware of himself as an instrument of the divine will; a necessary condition of the ethical character of his behaviour was ascesis. Here, in turn, two cases were possible: either the goal was escape or flight from the world (then asceticism was a means of liberation from all ties linking a person with the world) or the goal was transformation of the world (Calvinism) (in it ascesis served ends of inner-world, economic, scientific, or other activity).

The second, contemplative road had as its goal attainment of a state of mystical clarity or enlightenment, a *union mystica,* peace in the divine (godhead). The means were the same ascesis; as in the case of positive activity it also had a rational character. The rational-ascetic behaviour was directed, however, to renunciation of this world and absorption in the infinite.

As will be seen, the method of comparison and classification that Weber constantly resorted to called for constant differentiation and counterposing of the phenomena of religious consciousness. The basis for his differentiation was once again ideal types, which figured as the rational principle, the charismatic principle, and finally the traditional one.

Behind these ideal types stood his own 'ultimate values': (1) the ethic of brotherly love ('good'); (2) 'reason', liberated from values and made purely functional, i.e., formal rationality (the former 'truth', secularised to a mechanism); (3) the spontaneous, elemental ecstatic principle, charisma, the basis of magical religions (irrational 'force', elemental 'power', 'beauty', on whose side was the most irrational vital force, sexual love).

These three 'principles' were undoubtedly ideal types, and they did not, as a rule, emerge in pure form in empirical reality. There is no doubt, however, that they were all basic 'values', which are both attracted and opposed to each other, in Weber's outlook, just like the ideal types constructed on their basis.

> We realize again today that something can be sacred not only in spite of its not being beautiful, but rather because and in so far as it is not beautiful. You will find this documented in the fifty-third chapter of the book of Isaiah and in the twenty-first Psalm. And, since Nietzsche, we realize that something can be beautiful, not only in spite of the aspect in which it is not good, but rather in that very aspect. You will find this expressed earlier in the *Fleurs du mal,*

as Baudelaire named his volume of poems. It is commonplace to observe that something may be true although it is not beautiful and not holy and not good.[74]

Polytheism, 'the eternal struggle of the gods', was the ideological basis of Weber's thinking, and it came out with especial clarity in the sociology of religion, since he himself treated religion as the ultimate, not further reducible basis of all values. It was impossible, according to him, to reconcile warring 'values'; no scientific thinking, no philosophical meditation, could find adequate grounds for preferring one group of values to another.

> I do not know how one might wish to decide 'scientifically' [he wrote] the value of French and German culture; for here, too, different gods struggle with one another, now and for all times to come.
>
> ...Fate, and certainly not 'science', holds sway over these gods and their struggles...
>
> What man will take upon himself the attempt to 'refute scientifically' the ethic of the Sermon on the Mount? For instance, the sentence, 'resist no evil', or the image of turning the other cheek? And yet it is clear, in mundane perspective, that this is an ethic of undignified conduct; one has to choose between the religious dignity which this ethic confers and the dignity of manly conduct which preaches something quite different; 'resist evil—lest you be co-responsible for an overpowering evil'. According to our ultimate standpoint, the one is the devil and the other God, and the individual has to decide which is God for him and which is the devil.[75]

This 'polytheism' at the level of 'ultimate values' can be found in Weber more as a thinker close in his outlook to the precepts and traditions of Hobbes, Machiavelli, and Nietzsche, rather than as a follower of Kant and neo-Kantians. It was from the former that he inherited his austere, courageous striving to understand the truth, whatever it be; and it was from their tradition that his deep conviction arose that the truth was terrible and cruel rather than consoling and comforting. He also inherited his kind of 'regardlessness' and 'love of fate', however cruel the latter, from Nietzsche.

Weber's sociology absorbed and took in all the contradictions

characteristic of modern capitalist society; and they blew up his thinking from within. In order to overcome them he would have had to alter the very premisses of his thinking and to overcome the limits of the bourgeois-liberal world outlook, which he could not do consciously and in principle, and did not want to do. In 1885 he unambiguously declared that he was a member of the bourgeois class and felt himself such, and had been brought up in its views and ideals.[76]

12. Max Weber in Historical Perspective

The ambivalence of Weber's theoretical position coincided with the ambivalence and inconsistency of the socio-political position of German national liberalism. The capitalist class in Germany had been compelled at the turn of the century to fight not only against right-wing conservative forces, as it had earlier, but also against forces much more to the left and more radical than itself. The frame of mind of the German middle classes, 'squeezed' between the feudal, Junker estate, which had not yet left the scene, and the proletariat, which had already come into the scene, found expression in Weber's political orientation.

His position also explains his ambivalent attitude to Marx. On the one hand, he recognised Marx as an outstanding scholar who had laid the foundations for the study of capitalism and who had seen a powerful factor of progressive development in it compared with the feudal type of economy. On the other hand, however, Weber considered the conclusions Marx drew from the analysis of capitalism to be utopian; he did not accept the road of revolutionary transformation of capitalism proposed by Marx; and he considered it impossible to build a new type of society, socialist society.

Marx's influence, as I have already remarked, showed in the formation of one of the most important concepts of Weber's sociology, viz., the concept of rationality. But Weber waged a polemic on this against Marxism, trying to show that formal rationality as a principle of the modern capitalist economy was not a result of capitalist production but arose from a constellation of a whole number of various factors at a certain

historical moment. Formal rationality, according to him, was the destiny of Europe (and now of all mankind) which it was impossible to avoid. Weber considered utopian the Marxian doctrine of the overcoming of capitalism and of the possibility of building a new type of society—socialist society; he was not inclined to idealise the capitalist world, but he saw no alternative to it. Rationality, exposed, already purely formal, and lacking any value content, found in Weber its advocate; it was on that basis that he continued to consider himself a middle-class liberal, without illusions.

Weber rooted formal rationality not only in the economy but also in science, law, and religious ethics, so as to prove that the economic reorganisation of society could not bring the desired result.

His methodological principles were also shaped by his polemic against Marxism. His requirement of freedom from values, for instance, was clearly directed against the principle of partisanship in the social sciences. Weber sharply distinguished scientific knowledge, as objective knowledge not depending on the scientist's ideological position, and political activity, even of the same scientist himself, as two different spheres, each of which should be independent of the other. But as I have already shown, Weber himself could not realise this rigid division.

The construction of ideal types, in his sense, was to serve as a means of research 'independent of values'. He developed the method of ideal typing in direct polemic against the historical school, and indirectly against Marx. The latter, in fact, had striven in his works to understand society as a certain whole, employing for that purpose the method of ascending from the abstract to the concrete, by which the whole could be reproduced in a concept. Weber, fighting all his life against those sociologists and historians who relied on whole structures, was undoubtedly also fighting Marx. His creation of the theory of social action, which was meant to start from the individual and subjective contemplation of his behaviour, was the result of a polemic not only against the organicists (Le Bon and Durkheim), but also against Marxism, to which he ascribed, without grounds, an underestimation of the role of human consciousness and individual motivation in the dynamics of the socio-historical process.

0–1147

Weber's influence on non-Marxian sociology was immense, but ambiguous. Parsons, who did much to popularise him in the USA, exerted no little effort to synthesise Weber's ideas with those of Pareto and Durkheim in the context of a single theory of social action; Weber's theoretical categories were torn out of their historical context for that purpose and converted into concepts with a timeless content. At the same time Weber was utilised as a banner of the antinaturalist orientation in sociology. The crisis of structural functionalism in the 1960s strengthened interest in his antipositivist ideas and historicism, but at the same time evoked sharp criticism of his methodological objectivism, and principle of 'freedom from values', from the left (Alvin Gouldner and others). The attitude to Weber in West German sociology, or rather its interpretation, became a watershed in the same period between positivistic, scientistic and left Marxian orientations (in particular the Frankfort School); this conflict, which covered a very broad range of matters, came out especially clearly at the congress of West German sociologists in 1964 devoted to Weber's centenary.[77]

In Marcuse's paper, as in the earlier *Dialektik der Aufklärung* (Dialectics of Enlightenment) of Horkheimer and Adorno (1947), the ambiguity with which Weber related to the principle of rationality was in essence removed, and his position on this point interpreted as unambiguously negative. The situation changed in the mid-70s; today West German sociology is passing through a kind of 'Weber renaissance' oriented in a diametrically opposite direction to the interest in him in the left radical sociology of the 60s. This new trend found expression in the works of Constans Seyfarth, Gert Schmidt, Wolfgang Schluchter, and others.[78] The writers of this trend, on the one hand, bring out the ethical roots of the principle of rationality and, on the other hand, propose a concrete sociological interpretation of it so as to show what social strata have been the bearers of it during the history of modern times. Jürgen Habermas continues to defend the ideas of the Frankfort School—with certain reservations, incidentally—against these scholars.[79]

Notes

[1] Ben B. Seligman. *Main Currents in Modern Economics. Economic Thought since 1870* (The Free Press, Glencoe, III., 1962), p 24.

[2] Max Weber. Über einige Kategorien der verstehenden Soziologie. *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Wissenschaftslehre* (Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen, 1922), p 473.

[3] Max Weber. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization.* Translated by A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons (Oxford University Press, New York, 1947), p 113.

[4] See Max Weber. Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft. In: *Grundriss der Sozialökonomik,* III. Abteilung (Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen, 1925), p 10.

[5] 'In order to see the real causal connections, *we construct unreal ones'.* Max Weber. *Gesammelte politische Schriften* (Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen, 1951), p 287.

[6] See Max Weber. Die 'Objektivität' sozialwissenschaftlicher und sozialpolitischer Erkentnis. *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Wissenschaftslehre,* p 190.

[7] A. Walter. Max Weber als Soziologe. *Jahrbuch für Soziologie,* 1926, 2:3.

[8] Examples of Weber's genetic ideal types were 'the mediaeval town', 'Calvinism', 'Methodism', the 'culture of capitalism', etc. They were all formed, he explained, by stressing one aspect of the empirically given facts. The differences between them and general family concepts was, however, that family concepts (he suggested) were obtained by bringing out one of the attributes of all the given phenomena, while a genetic ideal type did not presuppose such a formal universality.

[9] See Hans Freyer. *Soziologie als Wirklichkeitswissenschaft. Logische Grundlegung des Systems der Soziologie* (Verlag von B.G. Teubner, Leipzig, 1930), p 148.

[10] See Max Weber. *Über einige Kategorien der verstehenden Soziologie. Op. cit.,* pp 403-404.

[11] Max Weber. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization,* p 88.

[12] Max Weber. *Über einige Kategorien... Op. cit.,* p 408.

[13] *Ibid.,* p 415.

[14] Max Weber. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization,* p 88.

[15] *Ibid.*

[16] See Talcott Parsons. *The Social System* (The Free Press, New York; Collier, Macmillan Limited, London; 1966), p 4.

[17] Max Weber. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization,* p 101.

[18] See Reinhard Bendix and Guenther Roth. *Scholarship and Partizanship. Essays on Max Weber* (Univ. of California Press, Berkeley, 1971), pp 290-291.

[19] Max Weber. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization,* p 109.

[20] See Max Weber. *Über einige Kategorien... Op. cit.,* p 404.

[21] Weber needed the concept of legitimately oriented rational behaviour in order to characterise objectively rational action; goal-oriented and legitimately-oriented rational actions coincided when the means subjectively chosen as most adequate to achieve a certain end were also the objectively most adequate ones.

[22] Max Weber. *Über einige Kategorien... Op. cit.,* p 408.

[23] *Ibid.,* p 411.

[24] Max Weber. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization,* p 90.

[25] See Max Weber. *Über einige Katogorien... Op. cit.,* p 410.

[26] Max Weber. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization,* p 101.

[27] *Ibid.*

[28] See Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills (Eds.) *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology* (OUP, New York, 1946), p 55. Cited from Lewis A. Coser. *Op. cit.,* p 218.

[29] *Ibid.,* p 219.

[30] Wolfgang Mommsen, an authority on Weber, quite rightly considered this position an echo of the methodological principles of classical humanism. Weber's sociology, he wrote, was not at all free of values; even its radically individual starting point could be considered understandable only by starting from the European humanist tradition and its respect for the individual. (See Wolfgang J. Mommsen. *Max Weber und die deutsche Politik. 1890-1920.* J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen, 1959, p 69.)

[31] Max Weber. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization,* p 112.

[32] On this point see the interesting polemic between Wolfgang Mommsen and Johannes Winckelmann in Mommsen's *Max Weber und die deutsche Politik. 1890-1920,* pp 414-419.

[33] Max Weber. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, p 115.

[34] *Ibid.*, p 116.

[35] *Ibid.*, p 117.

[36] *Ibid.*

[37] Talcott Parsons noted, when analysing Weber's conception of social action, that the category of 'traditionalism has little theoretically to do with the psychological concept of habit'. See his *The Structure of Social Action* (The Free Press, Glencoe, III., 1949), p 647.

[38] Max Weber. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, p 123.

[39] *Ibid.*, pp 184-185.

[40] Karl Marx. Economic Manuscripts of 1857-58. In: Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. *Collected Works*, Vol. 28 (Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1986), pp 222-223.

[41] Weber never denied this influence, incidentally. Furthermore, he classed Marx among the thinkers who had most strongly influenced the socio-historical thought of the twentieth century. See Eduard Baumgarten. *Max Weber. Werk und Person* (Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen, 1964) pp 554-555.

[42] Karl Marx. *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* (Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977), p 56.

[43] *Ibid.*, p 58.

[44] Karl Löwith. Max Weber und Karl Marx. In: *Gesammelte Abhandlungen. Zur Kritik der geschichtlichen Existenz* (W. Kohlhammer Verlag, Stuttgart, 1960), p 27.

[45] Max Weber. *Staatssoziologie* (Duncker & Humblot, Berlin, 1956), p 99.

[46] *Ibid.*

[47] *Ibid.*

[48] *Ibid.*, p 100.

[49] Max Weber. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, pp 333-334.

[50] *Ibid.*, p 337.

[51] Max Weber. *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Soziologie und Sozialpolitik* (Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen, 1924), p 413.

[52] Max Weber. *Staatssoziologie*, p 101.

[53] Patriarchal domination was the truest type of traditional domination, Weber wrote *(Ibid.*, p 103). It will readily be noted here that his differentiating of the traditional and legitimate types of authority sprang

in essence from a counterposing of the two main types of social structure—*Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft*—made by Tönnies.

[54] Weber repeatedly noted the instability and weakness of legitimacy in the modern legal state; the legal type of domination, though suitable for modern industrial society, seemed to him to need a certain 'reinforcing'. That is why he considered it useful to retain the hereditary monarch as head of state, as has happened in some European countries.

[55] *Ibid.*, p 104.

[56] *Ibid.*, p 103.

[57] *Ibid.*, p 104.

[58] Max Weber. *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, p 361.

[59] *Ibid.*, p 363.

[60] Max Weber. *Staatssoziologie*, p 105.

[61] And it was morals and customs, as Weber himself showed, that gave law its legitimacy!

[62] In order to avoid one-sidedness when examining Weber's political views, we must bear in mind that he never doubted the need for a parliament that could limit the power of a leader elected by plebiscite and exercise a control function in relation both to him and to the administrative apparatus.

[63] Arthur Mitzman. *Iron Cage: An Historical Interpretation of Max Weber* (Alfred A. Knopf, New York, 1970), pp 168-185.

[64] In this connection see the appendix to a German edition of this work (Max Weber. *Die protestantische Ethik*, München, Hamburg, 1965).

[65] See Wolfgang J. Mommsen. *Op. cit.*, p 35.

[66] Weber published a series of papers on the sociology of world religions between 1916 and 1919 in *Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik* (1916, *41;* 1916-17, *42;* 1917-18, *44;* 1918-19, *46*).

[67] See Maurice Merleau-Ponty. *Les aventures de la dialectique* (Gallimard, Paris, 1955); Max Scheler. *Die Wissensformen und die Gesellschaft* (Francke, Bern, 1960).

[68] Ernst Cassirer. *Philosophie der symbolischen Formen*, Vol. (Cassirer, Berlin, 1925).

[69] Max Weber. *Economy and Society. An Outline of Interpretive Sociology*, Vol. 1 (Univ. of California Press, Berkeley, 1978), p 399

[70] *Ibid.*

[71] *Ibid.*, p 400.

[72] See Wolfgang Bessner. *Die Begriffsjurisprudenz, der Rechtspositivismus und die Transzendentalphilosophie Immanuel Kants as Grundl*

ren der Soziologie und der politischen Ethik Max Webers. Dissertation (Dissertationsdruck, Blasaditsch, Augsburg, 1968), p 78.

[73] Max Weber. Religious Rejections of the World and Their Direction. In: *From Max Weber, Op. cit.*, p 323.

[74] Max Weber. Science as a Vocation. In: *From Max Weber, Op. cit.*, pp 147-148.

[75] *Ibid.*, p 148.

[76] See Max Weber. *Gesammelte politische Schriften* (Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), Tübingen, 1951), p 26.

[77] See Eduard Baumgarten. *Op. cit.;* Ernst Cassirer. *Op. cit.*

[78] See Constans Seyfarth. Gesellschaftliche Rationalisierung und die Entwicklung der Intellektuellenschichten. Zur Weiterführung eines zentralen Themas Max Webers. In: Walter M. Sprondel und Constans Seyfarth (Eds.). *Max Weber und die Rationalisierung sozialen Handelns* (Ferdinand Enke Verlag, Stuttgart, 1981), pp 189-223; Gert Schmidt. Max Webers Beitrag zur empirischen Industrieforschung. In: *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie,* 1980, *32,* 1: 76-92; Wolfgang Schluchter. The Paradox of Rationalization. On the Relations of 'Ethics' and 'World' in Max Weber. In: *Zeitschrift für Soziologie,* 1976, *5,* 3: 256-284.

[79] Jürgen Habermas. *Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns,* Vol. I, (Suhrkamp, Frankfort-on-Main, 1981), pp 240ff.

12

THE SOCIOLOGICAL SYSTEM OF VILFREDO PARETO

Elena Osipova

1. Pareto and His Time

At the turn of the century a positivism distinguished by its unoriginality and diversity dominated philosophy in Italy. Positivist sociological thought was also eclectic, combining elements of mechanicism, evolutionism, vulgar biologism, and other trends. Such were the conceptions of Cesare Lombroso (1836-1909), Enrico Ferri (1856-1929), and others. The ideas of members of the Italian school of political sociology—Gaetano Mosca (1858-1941), Robert Michels (1876-1936)—became well known; the views of Vilfredo Pareto (1848-1923) were directly quite close to them.

The son of an aristocrat who had emigrated to France for political reasons, Pareto was trained as an engineer and began to work for the Rome Railway Company. Having early become involved in political struggle, he began to write in the press with a critique of the government's economic policy, calling for freedom of trade and non-interference by the state in private business.

The shaping of his scientific interests was influenced by the leading Italian economist Matteo Pantaleoni, and Léon Walras, the professor of political economy in Lausanne University. The theory of economic equilibrium developed by Walras, transferred by Pareto to the field of general theoretical notions of society, subsequently became the basis on which he built his

sociological system. Pareto published a number of articles devoted to Walras's theory, and after the latter's retirement in 1893 succeeded to his chair.

Pareto's first major publication *Cours d'économie politique* was based on his university lectures. Later he criticised the policy of the government, was friends with many socialists, and took up defence of Dreyfus.

Around 1900 a change took place in his moods and convictions, owing to the collapse of his former liberal illusions. Convinced that the day of liberalism had passed, that society had entered a period of stagnation, and that coercion was necessary in order to ensure stability of social life, he took up an openly antidemocratic and antiliberal position. His new views found reflection in *Les systèmes socialistes* (1901), and his *Manual of Political Economy* (1906), as well as in a number of articles.

Heart disease forced Pareto to give up professorial activity, and in 1907 he gave up leadership of the chair, retaining only the reading of lectures (until 1917). In 1912 he completed his main work, entitled *Trattato di sociologia generale* (Treatise on General Sociology), but because of the outbreak of war it only appeared in 1916.

When the fascists came to power in Italy they showered Pareto with honours. He was made a 'Senator of the Kingdom of Italy', began to contribute to the journal *Gerarchia*, and so on. He died within a year of the fascists' coming to power, without having ever defined his attitude to the new regime, which, though it applied the methods of coercion recommended by him, did not, however, resolve any of the socio-economic contradictions.

Philosophically his sociology was a synthesis of positivism and voluntarist irrationalism. The ideals of the French sociologist and theorist of anarchosyndicalism Georges Sorel (1847-1922) had a big influence on him, especially Sorel's theory of violence and identification of revolutionary principles with religious myths; so, too, did the conceptions of Gaetano Mosca about the universality of the division of society into two classes—the ruling class, monopolising power, and the subject class, ruled by the former.

2. Methodology

Pareto intended his sociological system to put an end to the metaphysical and speculative discussion of society which had had a dominant position in nineteenth-century socio-political thought. The main idea inspiring him was to work out principles of the structure of sociological knowledge that would ensure its reliability, effectiveness, and substantiation. While holding, on the whole, the conception of social science developed by the founders of positivism, Comte, John Stuart Mill and Spencer, Pareto justly criticised them for inconsistency in following the principle of empirical substantiation of knowledge.

He considered sociology to be a synthesis of various special social disciplines (law, political economy, political history, history of religion), the aim of which was to study human society as a whole.[1]

Pareto called the method, by which he aimed to disclose the universal principles of the structure, functioning, and changes of societies logico-experimental. In trying to make sociology an exact science like physics, chemistry, and astronomy, he proposed to employ only empirically substantiated descriptive statements, strictly observing logical rules in the passage from observation to generalisation. Ethical and, in general, value elements in a theory led, in his view, to distortion and falsification of the facts, and should therefore be eliminated.

Any theory could be treated from three aspects (in his view): (1) the objective–independent of the author and of the recipient of the theory; (2) the subjective–in line with the author and the recipient, when it became clear why the author had created his theory, and a given individual apprehended it; (3) the utilitarian–from the angle of its individual or social usefulness. In Pareto's opinion usefulness did not depend on the objectivity or subjectivity of a theory. In itself truth was neutral and its social quality was only discovered through its application to achieve definite aims. If the results proved useful for society, the theory too was useful. If the results were harmful, it meant that the theory did harm.[2] He considered, moreover, that all social theories were equally false, limited, and deformed in their content since no sociologist before him had been guided by the logico-experimental method.

Pareto's treatment of the problems of causality, regularity, social fact, and certain other more secondary methodological matters bore the stamp of the influence of Machism. Like most positivists he called for the concepts 'absolute' and 'necessary' to be discarded since they were alleged to include an a priori content, the hallmark of metaphysics and theology. He suggested depicting the dependencies between social facts in the form of quantitative formulas and indices. The sociologist, he claimed, was interested in the intensity, strength, and weight of the various social conditions and facts, not in the essential, necessary character of the relation between them. The concept 'essence', and likewise the concept 'necessity', seemed archaic survivals to him. 'Essences ... are entities unknown to science,' he wrote,[3] and interpreted a scientific law as a 'uniformity', a repeatable event that had a probable character and did not contain an element of necessity. As he understood it, a law also lacked universal character and held only *'within the limits of the time and experience known to us'*.[4] Closeness to the conventionalist interpretation of law was expressed not only in his affirmation of a law's hypothetical and probability character but also in his claim that it depended on some point of view of the investigator's, on the latter's subjective choice of angle for examining the connections of phenomena. Pareto did not draw a sharp line between objective laws that expressed objective, necessary relations independent of man in nature and society, and laws formulated by people with a definite aim and in accordance with the researcher's tasks, i.e. hypotheses.

The absence of clear boundaries between the objective and subjective was also characteristic of his interpretation of the concept 'social fact'. He saw no difference between facts from the angle of their epistemological nature, material or ideal, and from the standpoint of their truth or falsity.

That approach was fraught with deep contradictions and led to misunderstanding of the specific nature of various ideological phenomena (for example, religion). On the theoretical, methodological plane it led either to a functionalist interpretation of truth (all that exists is true), or to exclusion of problems of truth from science (like the conformity of knowledge to reality) as having no relation to methodology.

Since the concept of causality expressed a relation that could

not be observed, Pareto also threw doubt on it. Criticising the principle of monocausality, he concluded that the relation of causality should be replaced by a relation of interdependence or interaction. In denying the causal priority of any one phenomenon, he called for the causal connection to be replaced by a functional one and the causal explanation, too, by a functional one. Since every social phenomenon was a function of many variables, social theory should pay attention to all the factors operating in society and establish relations of constant dependencies between them.

On those grounds he rejected the concept of linear evolution, claiming that 'evolution does not take place along a continuous line'.[5]

Pareto attached great importance to precision of scientific terminology. But he did not give a rigorous, precise definition of the main concepts he employed. And his intention to give the *Treatise* a mathematical form remained declarative. He did not go further than geometrical and algebraic illustrations, formulas, and graphs.

By identifying the value aspect of a theory with a lie added to its logico-experimental structure, he took up a stance of freedom from values. But the divorce of theory from practice, the reduction of truth to the correctness of formal logic, his rejection of determinism as a principle of the study and explanation of social phenomena deprived Pareto of the chance not only to interpret the facts of social life of interest to him correctly, but also to understand the origin and essence of the social theories he was trying to get away from, and that he justly criticised in many respects.

3. Society as a System of the Interactions of Individuals

One of Pareto's central ideas was to regard society as a system in a state of gradual disturbance and restoration of equilibrium. He took this concept from Walras's economic theory, to which Pareto gave a mechanical character, seeing a prototype of society in a model of equilibrium all parts of which were strictly interconnected and mechanically influenced one another. Changes in one part of the system were immediately transmitted to the

others, and brought the whole system into motion, until dynamic equilibrium was again restored.

Pareto treated the economy as a subsystem of the social system. In his view, the economic system consisted of individual molecules—people—who were brought into motion by needs and rational interests, and who encountered obstacles in the way of their achieving the economically desirable. The social system was more complex. Human individuals were involved in social action. It was sentiments governed by the individuals' psychic stamp that were the mainspring that put the whole system into action. It was much more difficult to understand these feelings than any rational considerations.

Pareto divided social actions into logical and non-logical, and in order to find criteria for differentiating them, he broke an action down into its component elements, viz., the externally observable action and its rational basis (which was usually given *post factum*), and the mental state of the acting person. He regarded the last-named as a constant underlying the action and determining its character. He considered the individual's mental state the objective basis of a social phenomenon, in contrast to its subjective basis, by which he understood the arguments rationally advanced by the actor.[6]

The mistake of all preceding sociologists, he suggested, was that they ignored the objective aspect of the matter and only studied the theoretical conceptions arising from it, i.e., limited themselves to study of the subjective aspect of reality. 'Objective' sociological research, however, should be directed to study of the mental orientations, and the 'non-logical' actions governed by them, that constituted the bulk of all human actions in general. 'Non-logical' actions, according to Pareto, are governed by a special logic of sentiments. In contrast to 'logical' ones they were the result of a person's emotional state, and of an irrational mental process, rather than of conscious arguments and considerations.

'Non-logical' actions were characterised by the people who performed them not knowing the true objective connections between phenomena, and therefore employing inadequate means to achieve ends, linking ends and means 'non-logically'. The connections of ends and means were illusory in that case and existed only in the notions of the acting subject. Such, for

example, were offerings and sacrifices, and other religious rites whose aim was to placate the divinity and so achieve the posed goal. Means of that kind were not objectively linked with the goal and therefore did not lead to attainment of it.

'Logical' actions were guided by reason rather than sentiments, and were regulated by norms and standards. They were characteristic of activity in the realm of economics, science, and (to some extent) of politics. In that case the means and ends were linked together by an objective logic based on really existing connections, and therefore led to attainment of the ends. In other words, the means were adequate here to the ends. Pareto pointed out the importance of this last element, since all actions seemed, from the subjective point of view, to be logical to those who performed them.

In trying to find objective grounds for treating 'non-logical' actions on another plane. Pareto proposed to take the 'standpoint of other persons who have a more extensive knowledge' as the criterion of objectivity.[7]

Examination of the structure and elements of a social action, and equally their classification according to the degree of consciousness or dominant type of motivation, were, in themselves, legitimate. But Pareto's conception of a social action had an individualistic and irrationalist character, one-sidedly stressing the emotional nature of human motives, for which he did not find any other explanation than one that indicated their natural origin. The motivating reasons of the social actions of big social groups and classes could not be explained from such positions. For classes unite individuals who have very different mental features; that, however, does not prevent these individuals from acting together at some moment of history.

The conception of social action developed by Pareto was based on a certain conception of man. In stressing the non-logical, irrational nature of the individual, he claimed that a person's actions were never what they seemed to him himself. The specifically human consisted in a capacity to employ reason to disguise one's 'non-logical' actions by means of seemingly logical theories and arguments, and not in reason. The human being, he wrote, in contrast to the animal, 'wants to think, and he also feels impelled to keep his instincts and sentiments hidden from view'.[8] And it was because all people were feeling creatures,

as well as reasonable ones, that the problem arose of the relation of feelings and reason, sentiments and ideology. Pareto unhesitatingly gave priority to sentiments, considering them the true driving forces of human history. He reduced history patterns to regularities of the irrational mental life of separate individuals, and called ideologies the 'languages of sentiments'.

By considering emotions the basis of the social system's dynamism, Pareto thereby laid a biological foundation under the social system, since he interpreted a human being's psyche, features, and peculiarities outside of and independent of the socio-economic context. Although his approach to society as a system was itself legitimate, the principle of mechanical equilibrium, and the mechanical relationship of the elements could not satisfactorily explain the functioning of society as a whole.

The idea of functional dependence, divorced from the principle of social determinism and meant to replace it, revealed its theoretical unsoundness as an explanatory principle. Pareto was compelled, in order to find the source of the system's motion, to take up a stance of biologism and psychologism, i.e., to seek the source of social life in people's psychological inclinations and dispositions and, moreover, ones that had no links with production and economic activity, and were very arbitrarily selected.

4. Psychological Reductionism

Having made the emotional sphere of human activity the main link in his sociological system, Pareto made the reservation that only those sentiments were worthy of the sociologist's attention (and not all) that were manifested in actions of a certain kind and that made it possible to classify them rigorously. They were invariable, and constant, and were therefore the elements of the social system which 'determine the social equilibrium'.[9] He gave them the unusual name of 'residues', difficult to interpret, which signified in the language of chemistry the 'sedimentation' or 'residuals', wanting thereby to stress their stability, and capacity 'to be left over' after all rational considerations had been abstracted from a social action.

According to Pareto 'residues', as the basis of sentiments, emotions, passions, instincts, and psychological states and dispositions, were innate and natural, and were not subject to the influence of conditions of an external character. They were the inner, biological impulses that determined a person's social behaviour. He tried to explain all the numerous variants of human behaviour from six main classes of 'residues', divided into a host of subgroups. Having systematised historical actions even further, he stressed the main role of the first two classes of 'residues'.

The first class he called the 'instinct for combinations',[10] which he claimed underlay all social changes. This was a person's inner psychological inclination to collect things, to rearrange and combine them in different ways, sometimes for the satisfaction of doing it, and sometimes because it was difficult for him to refrain from collecting and combining.

The second class consisted of 'group-persistences' (or 'persistence of aggregates')[11] –which expressed a tendency to maintain and preserve connections once formed. This conservative feeling underlay the unpleasantness of everything new and hostility to any changes and alterations.

Pareto included a person's 'need to express sentiment by external acts', 'sociality', 'integrity', and, finally, the sex instinct in the other classes of 'residues'.

In the concluding parts of the *Treatise* he tried to apply the theory of 'residues' to explain European history, depicting it as a conflict of 'residues' of the first and second classes, i.e., the instinct of changes and conservatism, of innovation and retrogradation. He treated 'non-logical' actions performed on the basis of 'residues' as the main cell of social life determining the course of the cyclical changes and reversions in history.

The unclarity of the concept 'residue', its complexity, and the host of terms it included (for example, 'sentiments', 'instincts', 'manifestations of sentiments in actions'), and the dual subject-object nature of the concept (psychological and social) in his interpretation, led to its not passing into the vocabulary of Western sociology.

The irrationalism of Pareto's conception had deep epistemological and social roots, the real basis of which was the crisis of the positivist, rationalistic model of man. At the same

time, his stressing of the decisive role of irrational psychic forces was linked with a profound social pessimism, loss of faith in human reason, discredited in the epoch of social crisis. In place of the idea of the rationality of all existence, an idea of its non-rationality and non-logicality was advanced; the idea of rationality was succeeded by an irrationalism of a biological colouring. Pareto's sociological conception was clear evidence of the impossibility of building a scientific theory of the personality and social action without relying on an adequate understanding of society.

Belief in the decisive role of 'residues' fed Pareto's political neo-Machiavellianism:

> the art of government lies in finding ways to take advantage of such sentiments, not in wasting one's energies in futile efforts to destroy them, the sole effect of the latter course very frequently being only to strengthen them.[1 2]

Having affirmed the underlying role of the emotional spheres of the human psyche, Pareto deduced his theories of ideology, social stratification, and change of ruling élites from them.

5. The Conception of Ideology

Pareto's interest in the theory of ideology, which was an integral part of his sociological system, was not fortuitous. Disappointment with the policy of middle-class liberal parties, which were incapable of effective action and were steeped in intrigues and power struggles, avoked a particularly negative attitude to the demagogic tricks and dodges of the dominant socio-political groupings, whose essence he saw in their striving to mask their dirty political aims. At the same time the rise in the popularity of Marxism in Italy convinced him of the strength and social significance of ideology, and stimulated a search for the often latent causes of its spread, and its influence on social life. While retaining a stance of defence of the capitalist order, Pareto endeavoured to explain the nature, special features, and social functions of ideology in the modern world.

Pseudo-logical arguments, empty holding forth, false ar-

guments, and false justifications and excuses were 'manifestations of the human being's hunger for thinking'.[13] The need for pseudo-logical theories justifying social behaviour, in which the means proposed for attaining the ends were not linked with them by objective logic, was expressed in the creation of theological, ethical, and political doctrines that veiled and glossed over the true essence of religion, morals, and politics. Social science should therefore bring out the foundation of these doctrines, i.e., the emotions governing them. For Pareto ideologies were purely verbal covers, adroit demagogic plays and tricks that were given a theoretical form so as to disguise the non-logical character of an action. Ideologies were created so as to hide the true impelling motives of actions whose roots lay in the irrational layers of the human mind. He called ideological conceptions, beliefs, and theories 'derivations', so stressing their secondary character, derived from emotions. And he developed a classification of them, dividing them into four classes.[14]

The first class consisted of assertions presented as absolute truths, axioms, or dogmas. The second class contained incompetent judgments justified by reference to authority. The third class consisted of accords with generally accepted principles and sentiments; the justification of this class often rested on the sentiments of the acting person, the possessor of certain 'residues', but was depicted as an accord with the sentiments of 'all men, the majority of men, all good men, and so on'.[15] The fourth class of derivations was formed by purely verbal arguments, 'verbal proofs', and expressions that had no objective equivalent, like the sophisms known from formal logic. Derivations of that kind, usually used by orators, were particularly active because the sentiments needed were aroused in hearers by means of adroitly employed turns of speech, so skilfully, moreover, that the listeners did not even notice them. Such derivations were highly valued in politics and court proceedings. They also included simple juggling with words and employment of popular, well-chosen words and turns of phrase.[16]

Pareto considered that false verbal phrases, derivations, ideologies, and religions defied precise scientific analysis. But he tried to find a way of explaining ideological phenomena. It was wrong, he said, to consider these pseudo-logical constructs as simply absurd or pathologies, or even to treat them as the

fruits of fantasy created by a priestly caste to stupefy the masses. When counterposing derivations (ideologies) to truth, he stressed at the same time that their logical inconsistency by no means reduced their social significance, or their value for society as a whole and for separate actors. 'The facts clearly show that mythologies have no reality and at the same time have the greatest social importance'.[17]

One must note the accuracy of some of Pareto's observations. He stressed, for instance, the active role of ideologies in society and their mobilising force:

> Generally speaking, a derivation is accepted not so much because it convinces anybody as because it expresses clearly ideas that people already have in a confused sort of way—this latter fact is usually the main element in the situation. Once the derivation is accepted it lends strength and aggressiveness to the corresponding sentiments, which now have found a way to express themselves.[18]

When bringing out the mechanism of the manipulation of mass consciousness, he wrote:

> The important thing is to have a derivation that is simple, and readily grasped by everybody, even the most ignorant people, and then to repeat it over and over and over again.[19]

Stressing the role of unconscious elements of the human mind, he formulated certain ideas of the psychology of the subconscious, although he was not acquainted with the works of Freud.

But, having separated the problem of non-logical action from social practice, Pareto took up a stance of relativism. In his view there were no differences of principle between the arguments used by pagans and Christians, and by proponents of progress, humanism, social solidarity, democracy, etc. All these theories were equally characterised by a predominance of sentiments over facts, and had no value from the scientific point of view. He denied that ideologies differed essentially from one another even when they arose at different levels of the development of society, and contained different proportions of truth and mythology. And, of course, he did not consider that the va-

rious forms of social consciousness reflected different aspects of social being. There was no historical concretisation of the problem when it was a matter of comparing the scientific value of ideologies that existed simultaneously. According to him ideologies only changed in form, replacing one system of argumentation with another, one verbal formulation with another, more flexible and subtle one. In fact he confined the problem of ideology within the narrow limits of the individual mind, separating it from real history and the struggle of classes in which the development of an ideology properly took place.

A logical consequence of Pareto's arguments was the thesis that there were different individuals who can free themselves of sentiments that deformed the image of reality.

> Experience shows that a person can as it were divide himself in two and, to an extent at least, lay aside his sentiments, preconceptions, and beliefs when engaged in a scientific pursuit, resuming them afterwards.[20]

Such people were, in his view, geniuses. It was the fate of 'commonplace writers of mediocre talents' to surrender to sentiments and preconceptions. The great geniuses,

> in virtue of their very qualities rise above the commonalty and stand apart from the mass of people. They therefore reflect less reliably the ideas, beliefs, and sentiments actually prevailing.[21]

That passage is evidence that Pareto was far from free of the illusions of positivist rationalism in spite of the irrationalism of his theory. According to his conceptions geniuses, leaders, and outstanding personalities in general were bearers of reason, while the masses were capable only of being guided by unconscious sentiments and passions.

It was characteristic of him that he tried to delimit the tasks of the logician and the sociologist.

> When the logician has discovered the error in a reasoning, when he can put his finger on the fallacy in it, his work is done. But that is where the work of the sociologist begins, for he must find out why the false argument is accepted, why the sophistry persuades . . .

> It is the province of logic to tell why a reasoning is false. It is the business of sociology to explain its wide acceptance.[22]

But his answer to this is by no means sociological:

> An assertion is accepted and gains prestige through the sentiments of various kinds which it excites in those who hear it, the sentiments so acquiring status as 'proof'. It convinces because it is stated in a doctoral, sententious tone, with great assurance, and in a choice literary language.[23]

Derivations were derivative and dependent in the general balance of social factors. Pareto was inclined to regard an aggregate of 'residues' and interests, and the social heterogeneity associated with them, as the social basis, and not socio-economic relations. He enthusiastically exposed and demystified various derivations. Legal theories, he said, were not a substantiation of the actual application of laws but only the use of false arguments in accordance with selfish ends. Moral derivations served to cover up amoral ends, religious ones to conceal base sentiments common, allegedly, to all ages and nations.

The influence of Karl Marx's fight against idealist ideological conceptions that deformed reality can be felt in Pareto's denunciatory fervour. But the positive solution to the problem of social consciousness proper to Marxism was unacceptable to him. It was impossible in general to explain why non-scientific ideologies distorted reality, and to analyse their content concretely and historically, i.e., to disclose their epistemological and class roots, from the theoretical positions accepted by Pareto. The concept of derivations revealed its insuperable narrowness, since they did not contain more than the sentiments whose expression they were. And the invariant 'residues' could not explain changes in ideologies. Nor could they reveal the latter's content.

The interpretation of ideology as a pseudo-logical substantiation of an action already completed or being performed—the basic cell of social life—also did not save the position. For Pareto interpreted social action itself in an exclusively psychological manner, as irrational by nature. If ideologies had an irrational character, and the motives formulated by them lay out-

side reason, what factors could then be called really causal? What sphere should they be looked for in? Marx and Engels had sought them in the conditions of individuals' social life, showing that

> the actions in each particular case were invariably initiated by material causes and not by the accompanying phrases, that on the contrary the political and legal phrases, like the political actions and their results, originated in material causes.[24]

Pareto, however, sought the source of ideological phenomena in the mind of the separately isolated individual, treating it unhistorically and abstractly. The real social forces that determined the individual's position in mass social movements, and the actions of the masses in general, did not interest him. The class structure of society, the interests and aspirations of the various social forces that were free, by virtue of their objective social position, to base themselves more or less consistently on science in their actions, had quite disappeared from his field of view. His rejection of a class, historical approach to ideological phenomena stamped his observations with a one-sided and limited nature. Ultimately he himself proved to be on paths of the 'false consciousness' he had seen it as his job to diagnose. For along with the requirements of a logico-epistemological character about which he spoke, a scientific theory, and the methodology of the social sciences, necessarily included a sociological analysis of social reality from the standpoint of certain class interests. A formalistic one-sidedness of methodology, and psychological reductionism determined the inadequacy of Pareto's conceptions of ideology.

6. The Idea of the Circulation of Elites

Social heterogeneity, which presupposed an initial psychological inequality of individuals, was an essential element of a social system, according to Pareto. The individuality of any social group depended on the natural capabilities and talents of its members, and that in turn determined the social position of the group on a certain rung of the social ladder. To the class that

had 'the highest indices in their branch of acitvity' he gave the name of *élite.*[25] The élite was a chosen part of the population; the remainder followed the impulse given by it.[26] The élite was divided in turn into two parts: one was directly or indirectly involved in the government of society (the 'governing élite' or 'ruling class'); the other was not involved in government and pursued an occupation in an artistic or scientific sphere (a 'non-governing élite').[27]

The élite and the 'non-élite' correspondingly formed the upper and lower strata of society. Members of the lower stratum, the most gifted of them, 'rose', replenishing the ranks of the governing élite, members of which, 'decaying', 'sank' into the masses. A circulation of élites (or 'class-circulation') took place, i.e., an interaction between the members of the heterogeneous society (which Pareto represented as a pyramid with the élite at the apex).

An élite was characterised by a high degree of self-assurance and prudence, and an ability to see the weak and most sensitive places in others, and to exploit them for its own profit, while the masses were usually confused and entangled in a network of sentiments and prejudices. That justified

> having a community divided into two parts, the one in which knowledge prevails ruling and directing the other in which sentiments prevail, so that, in the end, action is vigorous and wisely directed.[28]

Pareto pointed out two main qualities of the governors, viz., an ability to persuade, by manipulating human sentiments, and an ability to use force when necessary. These capacities were mutually exclusive. Governments ruled either by using force or by means of compromise and agreement. Consensus and coercion, he said, had been means of government throughout history.[29]

He developed the idea of government of the masses by manipulation of their sentiments by means of ideas that subordinated them to the interests of the governing classes. The work of the government, he wrote, was so much the easier the better it was able to make use of existing 'residues'.[30] Artful application of that principle was the explanation of any political success,

according to him. But it was quickly discovered in the course of political history that methods of persuasion alone were inadequate for the governing class's maintenance of power. It must know how to resort to force in good time. Pareto's accusatory critique was therefore directed against the 'sentimental' ideologies of liberalism and the humanism and compromises, etc. preached by them. When a ruling élite was incapable of using force, it decayed and was compelled to give way to another élite that was more decisive and capable of resorting to force. 'History is a graveyard of aristocracies,' he wrote.[31] The key to explaining the rise and fall of governing classes, and of their elevation and decay, lay in the mutually exclusive character of the two types of government.

The mechanism by which ruling élites were renewed in peace time was social mobility. The more 'open' a ruling class was, the stronger its 'health' and the more capable it was of maintaining its domination. The more closed it was, the stronger was the tendency to decay.

> The governing class is restored not only in numbers, but—and that is the more important thing—in quality, by families rising from the lower classes and bringing with them the vigour and the proportions of residues necessary for keeping themselves in power. It is also restored by the loss of its more degenerate members.[32]

With the exception of a completely closed élite, which had become a caste, a ruling élite was usually in a state of continuous, slow transformation. When the circulation of élites went too slowly, elements built up in the highest strata that were distinguished by powerlessness, demoralisation, and decay. These strata lost the mental qualities that guaranteed their élite position and were unable to cope with the need to employ force. And among the lowest classes a number of individuals arose who had the qualities needed to govern society. They were capable of seizing power by force. But the new governing class was transformed in turn into a feeble, decaying one, and lost the capacity to rule. It could renew itself either by drawing strength from the lower classes or by eliminating the physically degenerate, no longer necessary members of the élite. If individuals accumulated in the lower classes, however, in spite of

these measures, who surpassed the upper classes in achievements, a period of revolution would set in, whose sense, in Pareto's view, was to renew the composition of the governing élite, replenish the mental forces needed for governing, and so restore social equilibrium.

Pareto was convinced that the cycles of elevation and decline, of the rise and fall of an élite were necessary and inevitable. Alternation, fluctuation, and succession of élites was a law of the existence of human society. What was this law based on?

Pareto's theory started from a conviction that the circulation of élites was a consequence of an alternation in them of 'residues' of the first and second class. Each élite had a corresponding definite style of governing. An instinct of 'combinations' governed the use of persuasion and deceit, and of cunning means of bamboozling and misleading the masses.

A 'persistence of aggregates' instinct governed the opposing qualities of the rulers. They were aggressive, authoritarian, inclined to use force, and suspicious of manipulation, manoeuvring, and compromises. While the first type of ruler lived only in the now, the second aspired to the future. Rulers fabricated ideals, lay and religious; their aims stretched far ahead. The individual's dedication to the service of society, the subordination of individual interests to social ones, and courage and constancy in the pursuit of these aims were the characteristic features and spiritual values of this type of ruler.

Pareto called rulers among whom 'combination residues' predominated 'foxes', and those in which 'residues' of 'persistence of aggregates' predominated 'lions'. 'Foxes' were the symbol of cunning, chicanery, and treachery; the 'lions' were the symbol of strength, persistence, irreconcilability, and courage.

'Foxes' and 'lions' corresponded to the types of 'speculator' and 'rentier' in business and financial activity. The 'speculator' was the prototype of businessmen, magnates, schemers, and entrepreneurs who were striving for gain. He was immersed in risky combinations, had no pangs of conscience, and strove for success at any price. The 'rentier' was his complete opposite. He was a timid depositor, living on a fixed income, afraid to take steps that would damage his capital and cause himself inconvenience. A preponderance of 'rentiers' in society was evi-

dence of its stabilisation, passing later into decay and decline. A preponderance of 'speculators' predetermined development in social and economic affairs.

The alternation of business and political cycles was linked in Pareto's conception of equilibrium with cycles of spiritual production (intellectual, religious, artistic, etc.). A rhythmic succession of periods of faith and scepticism took place in it, on which Class I and Class II 'residues' ultimately rested. When Class I 'residues' were strengthened in the minds of individuals, and Class II 'residues' weakened, a change in the proportion of 'residues' took place in certain social groups. These groups were dissatisfied with the reality around them, were critical of the established order and the dominant values. In trying to create their own scientifically based and logically sustained theories and programmes they considered that a clearing of the road to reason, and emancipation from prejudices. But when these pseudo-intellectual theories gained the upper hand in society a counter-tendency of spiritual life inevitably arose. Individuals in whom feelings of 'persistence of aggregates' were strengthened criticised the fake logicality and rationality of the new theories, looking for mistakes and discrepancies in them. So anti-intellectual, intuitivist, and mystical theories arose that gradually superseded positivism and rationalism.

The theory of the 'circulation of élites' was built by Pareto, like the theory of social activity, on an investigation of the congenital biopsychic properties of individuals and not on analysis of social relations and social institutions. The personal features of rulers that they already possessed before they had an élite position in society were primary in his conception of power. When trying to pose the question of the relation of biological and social differentiation, he considered that the capitalist economy provided scope, in conditions favourable for its development, for free movement of its best members to the summit of society, and for reproduction of its structure in accordance with the biopsychic qualities of the individuals. He did not suggest that possession of the personal qualities necessary for government was merely one of the conditions for rise of the institution of domination, and not, moreover, the main and decisive one. In reality capitalist competition was controlled by the institution of capitalist private property. The

individuals who joined the struggle were already involved in a certain system of social relations and had advantages due to the position they occupied in society. The main factor in political success and selection of the 'best' from the contenders for power was the strength of the political classes and groups that stood behind them.

Political, ideological, and economic changes in society are not the simple consequence of changes in the composition of the ruling minority, as Pareto considered. The 'circulation of élites' in fact expressed deep-seated social processes, primarily of a socio-economic character. Political changes occurred when the governing groups could not cope with the socio-economic problems arising in the course of social practice, and were compelled to resort to political manoeuvres.

His arguments about the functioning of élites were not based on analysis of real mass social forces, and were not concretised in accordance with the different historical periods, but stressed attention to external, formal similarities of the various types of government brought into the general scheme. While making absolutes of the general features of the functioning of power élites in antagonistic society, Pareto did not consider that different historical periods presented the powers that be with different demands under the influence of which the governing groups formed on the basis of historically changing criteria were differentiated and weakened. Why that happened could only be explained from the standpoint of a dialectical materialist analysis of the class division of society that determined the corresponding peculiarities in the features of state forms and mechanisms.

Pareto drew an image of history repellent in its cynicism, compiled of pictures of violence, swindles, crimes, palace intrigues and fights and squabbles of the contenders for power. In those conditions humanism was no more than a prejudice or an ideology of self-humiliation; the future was in the hands of politicians who had no conscience, who did not give a thought to the social consequences of their actions so long as they led to the desired end. Only that élite could ensure social equilibrium which knew how to profit from power, was not fastidious about the means, caring, in any case, only for its own interests. 'The end justifies the means' Pareto said, repeating

Machiavelli's aphorism (he esteemed Machiavelli much above any modern writers).

Pareto's socio-historical conception was profoundly pessimistic. In his idea of it, history was doomed to eternally repeated cycles in the succession of which there was no notable progress; the ascending part of the curve was the 'cause' or the condition for its descending part—and no more.

As Franz Borkenau has justly remarked Pareto's 'pessimism need not be accounted for by a melancholy temperament'.[33] It is accountable by the collapse of the political ideals of a certain part of the capitalist class and its hatred of progress and democracy. Pareto made historical pessimism, which grew into a political ideology of conservatism idealising violence and force, his programmatic orientation.

7. Pareto in the Historical Perspective

The *Treatise* came out during the imperialist First World War and did not find a corresponding 'sociological' reader in Italy. In France Durkheim's school had a dominant position, defending a quite different theoretical stance. Later, the fact that the fascists proclaimed Pareto their spiritual father, alienated liberally minded circles from him.

Recognition came to him in America. In the early 1930s L. J. Henderson, an eminent biochemist, held a seminar at Harvard University to study Pareto's conceptions, in which eminent sociologists like Talcott Parsons, Robert Merton, and Clyde Kluckhohn, took part. The *Treatise* was published in English in 1935; and as Coser has remarked, Pareto's works were 'largely read as a kind of bourgeois answer to Marx, or as a conservative functional equivalent to him'.[34]

Sociologists of more 'leftist' political views sharply criticised Pareto for political Machiavellianism, fascism, and an unmodern mode of thinking.

> Emory Bogardus and Floyd House [Coser has said] wrote lengthy refutations in which they attempted to show that what was valid in Pareto had long been said much better by Englishmen and Americans such as Darwin, James and Sumner, and that the rest of his work was no good at all.[35]

But the monographs on Pareto written by Henderson, and above all by Parsons, did their job. Parsons, the head of the school of structural functionalism, considered Pareto one of the outstanding masters of sociology, declaring that 'there is in it [the *Treatise*] nothing essential on either the methodological or the theoretical level which . . . must be discarded'.[36]

Spokesmen of structural functionalism accepted and developed Pareto's theory of social action, and also his conception of society as a system in a state of equilibrium. The concept of equilibrium introduced by him occupied a leading place in structural-functional analysis as one of its main concepts and starting points of research. Pareto's systems approach to society promoted development of the sociological tradition that considered problems of the stability of the social system the main ones. Structural functionalists also considered a merit of Pareto's his denial of a simple straight causal relation in favour of an aggregate of variables in a state of functional interaction. Pareto aimed the idea of interaction against the conception of social determinism, and put it into a context of the theoretical quests of Western sociological thought. Capitalist economists valued his economic contribution just as highly, considering him one of the founders of modern political economy.[37]

Pareto himself considered his theory of 'residues' and 'derivations' his greatest contribution to social thought. The irrationalist conception of personality, integrated in the conception of 'non-logical' action, posed problems of the psychology of the subconscious in general outline. That finds reflection in contemporary Western social psychology, and in the treatment of such phenomena as distorted consciousness, the mechanism of rationalisation, the functioning of prejudices, and authoritarian personality.

Pareto's conception of ideology is very popular among contemporary Western political scientists. The understanding of ideologies as arbitrary theoretical constructs meant to mask and rationalise prejudices and sentiments stresses the important social role of systems of beliefs. The thesis that a human being is guided by emotionally coloured beliefs, without going into arguments about their truth or falsity, is widely employed in the theory and methods of capitalist propaganda.

The theory of élites probably attracted most attention

to Pareto's sociological system, and has served as the starting point for numerous studies of the mechanisms of power from various theoretical standpoints. This theory, taken in the context of Pareto's theoretical views, is grounds for considering him the prophet of political regimes of a fascist type. Whether he wanted it or not, Pareto's works reflected the crisis trends in the public affairs of Western Europe, whose development led to fascism. His concentration of attention on problems of political struggle, the idea of the biological selection of the governing élite, his justification of the use of brute force, trampling on legality, his critique of the rationalist approach to politics, and stressing of the significance of irrational, blind sentiments were all interwoven with ideas that underlay the writings of official fascist theorists.

The *Treatise* was intended as a 'gigantic rebuttal' of Marx. While denying Marx's contribution to political economy, Pareto attached great importance to him as a sociologist who stressed the role of class struggle in history. But he was a determined opponent of scientific socialism and sharply criticised historical materialism, which he mistakenly considered 'economic materialism'. 'Its error,' in his view, 'lies in representing that interdependence as a relation of cause and effect'.[38]

When one generalises the means of 'refuting' Marxism employed by Pareto, one can say that he was endeavouring to represent Marxist theory as a special case of his own 'broader' conception. The theory of class exploitation was to be dissolved in the 'broader' conception of the alternation of élites; class differences were a partial case of 'broader'—psychological—differences, etc. Marxian partisanship was opposed to a requirement to keep the logico-experimental orientation on a position free from value judgments and neutral objectivity.

Pareto's theoretical views were permeated with a spirit of historical hopelessness. He clearly saw that the bourgeoisie was in decline. He had no medicine, he wrote, to cure the sickness it, or all society, if you liked, had contracted. He himself clearly declared, on the contrary, that if any medicine did exist (and he did not think so) it was quite unknown to him. He thought himself in the position of a doctor who knew his patient was mortally ill with tuberculosis without knowing how to save him.[39]

Notes

[1] Vilfredo Pareto. *The Mind and Society*. Vol. I. Translated by Andrew Bongiorno and Arthur Livingstone (Harcourt, Brance, New York 1935), p 3.

[2] 'A theory that is experimentally true may be now advantageous, now detrimental, to society, and the same applies to a theory that is experimentally false. Many many people deny that.' *Ibid.*, p 171.

[3] *Ibid.*, p 16.

[4] *Ibib.*, p 35.

[5] *Ibid.*, p 307.

[6] *Ibid.*, p 76.

[7] *Ibid.*, p 77.

[8] *The Mind and Society*, Vol. III, p 888.

[9] *Ibid.*, p 1126.

[10] *The Mind and Society*, Vol. II, p 516.

[11] *Ibid.*, p 517.

[12] *The Mind and Society*, Vol. III, p 1281.

[13] *Ibid.*, p 889.

[14] *Ibid.*, p 899.

[15] *Ibid.*, p 926.

[16] Ben B. Seligman. *Main Currents in Modern Economics. Economic Thought since 1870* (The Free Press of Glencoe, Glencoe, Ill., 1962).

[17] *The Mind and Society*, Vol. III, p 1112.

[18] *Ibid.*, p 1202.

[19] *Ibid.*, p 1209.

[20] *The Mind and Society*, Vol. I, p 72.

[21] *Ibid.*, p 324.

[22] *The Mind and Society*, Vol. III, p 894.

[23] *Ibid.*, p 903.

[24] See Frederick Engels' review of Marx's *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*. In: Karl Marx. *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy* (Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1977), p 221.

[25] Vilfredo Pareto. *The Mind and Society*, Vol. III, p 1423.

[26] *The Mind and Society*, Vol. I, p 169.

[27] *The Mind and Society*, Vol. III, p 1423.

[28] *Ibid.*, p 1241.

[29] Vilfredo Pareto. *Trattato di sociologia generale*, Vol. II, (Edizioni di Communita, Milan, 1964), p 678.

[30] *Ibid.*, p 676.

[31] *The Mind and Society*, Vol. III, p 1430.

[32] *Ibid.*, pp 1430-1431.

[33] Franz Borkenau. *Pareto* (Chapman & Hall, London, 1936), p 161.

[34] Lewis A. Coser. *Masters of Sociological Thought* (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, New York, 1977), p 423.

[35] *Ibid.*, p 424.

[36] Talcott Parsons. *The Structure of Social Action* (The Free Press, Glencoe, III., 1949), p 300.

[37] Maurice Allais. Pareto, Vilfredo. Contributions to Economics. In: *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, Vol. 11 (The Macmillan Co., and The Free Press, New York, 1972), pp 399-408.

[38] Vilfredo Pareto. *The Mind and Society*, Vol. I, p 500.

[39] Cited from: Gottfried Eisermann. *Bedeutende Soziologen* (Ferdinand Enke Verlag, Stuttgart, 1968), pp 159-160.

13

SOCIOLOGY IN PREREVOLUTIONARY RUSSIA

Igor Golosenko

Sociology arose in Russia as an independent science of the patterns of development and functioning of social systems after the Reform of 1861, when certain official bans on the study of social problems that had previously existed were finally lifted. It had even been forbidden to use the terms 'society' and 'progress' in official papers and documents in prereform Russia. For all the monstrous contradictions of the emancipation of the peasants from serfdom, considerable changes took place in the economy and public affairs after the Reform and Russia made seven-league strides along the capitalist road.

Dissolution of the feudal system and the genesis of industrial capitalism became the 'principal theoretical problem' for Russian social studies at that time, as Lenin remarked.[1] Because of the specific historical features of the country (a mixed economy, a host of survivals of serfdom, the peasant commune, etc.), this problem had a discussion character, about the necessity and possibility, desirability and undesirability of capitalist evolution. The liberal democratic intellectuals who reflected the interests of peasant democracy (Neo-Slavophils, and Populists) were against capitalism, though starting from absolutely different theoretical, methodological, and ideological arguments. Combining a radical, middle-class democratic, anti-feudal programme with ideas of utopian socialism, this intelligentsia simultaneously opposed survivals of serfdom and a capitalist development of Russia.

Marxists, 'legal Marxists', and certain middle-class sociolo-

gists stood for recognition of capitalism. There was an even deeper differentiation associated with questions of the political perspectives for capitalist evolution in Russia as capitalism developed, the labour movement grew, and the socialist revolution matured.

The contradictory character of the ideological stance of middle-class sociologists determined the ambiguous character of their theoretical and methodological answers and specific studies. On the one hand, especially in the first decades after the Reform, the antifeudal trend made it possible for Russian social studies to carry out dedicated searches in the field of pure theory. Some of the results of them made it possible to formulate progressive scientific ideas, for example, justification of the union of sociology and history in the study of public opinion, the significance of economics in the development of society, the development of a comparative historical method on extensive factual data, etc. It was not fortutious that the studies of this kind made by Maxim Kovalevsky, Nicholas Kareev, and others, were highly esteemed and employed by the founders of Marxism. On the other hand, idealism, as the basis of their outlook, defence of private property, a tendency to subjectivism in theory and social practice, and hostility to Marxism determined the ultimate bankruptcy of Russian capitalist sociology.

A paradoxical situation built up in Russian social studies in the early 1860. Some concrete social sciences (history, jurisprudence, social statistics, etc.) had made some progress, but their further development called for a global methodological consideration of the material accumulated. At the same time, the philosophy of history had already proved paralysed by inner contradictions in the 40s and 50s (the dispute between the Westernisers and the Slavophiles, and philosophical anthropologism). In those conditions an interdisciplinary need arose for a new generalising social science.

This idea was first put forward in 1845 by Valerian Maikov, a talented social scientist, in an article 'The Social Sciences in Russia'. He gave the new science various names: the 'philosophy', and 'physiology' of society, and 'sociology'. But he defined its subject-matter and function distinctly: it was to study 'the social order (prosperity)', which consisted of a combination of three types–'economic', 'political' (requiring constitutional

equality, rights, and a coincidence of personal and public interests) and 'spiritual or moral'. All three types determined each other, interacted, and developed. The special sciences (jurisprudence, political economy, etc.) studied the types separately, but sociology studied the connections between them, taking their results into account, and investigated the integrated combination and harmony of the types, thanks to which it helped the specific social sciences to overcome their inevitable theoretical one-sidedness. Sociology would help them become practical sciences achieving concrete results in study of the whole of social reality.

Maikov illustrated his position by the following example: if slave trade was justified by considerations of economic gain, the social 'order' that grew up on that basis would not meet the requirements of moral development and well-being, just as the relative overcoming of material need would by no means yield a harmonious order while peoples were alienated from political power. Disparaging of any aspect of order at the expense of others would cause an inexorable decline of the whole. 'The living idea of the social sciences', Maikov suggested, consisted in creating a new philosophy of society that determined integral social prosperity.

> Society is nothing else than a form of human being. So the idea of the well-being of society cannot be separated, of course, from the idea of a person's prosperity or development. One may even say that the development of society is one of the conditions for the development of the individual.[2]

The future of 'Russian sociological science' presupposed the tackling of several matters, according to Maikov, the most important of which he considered to be 'a rigorous, critical review of the social sciences in the West', overcoming of the methodological 'feudalism' of the specific social sciences and unification of their advances in a general, ideological synthesis that would ensure their practical success and overcome the lifeless abstractness and subjectivism of the old philosophy of history on lines of scientific realism. This new science would arise of necessity and not by the whim and arbitrary will of some theorist, and would be governed by the same laws as the

particular humanitarian sciences. Maikov's conclusions were very shrewd. 'At the close of the 60s,' the historian Nicholas Kareev later recalled, 'positivism and sociology came into general Russian mental use.'

Russian sociology passed through four stages in its development, some of which succeeded one another, while others coexisted and interacted.

The first stage, that of the rise of the 'new science' (the end of the 60s to the end of the 80s) was characterised by a research excitement and enthusiasm all of its own. The boundary between everyday and scientific social knowledge was shifting all the time. The aims of studies were formulated very abstractly; the gathering and processing of material was methodologically precipitate and hasty. The sociological works of that time contained facts and generalisations of various kinds from different fields of knowledge–jurisprudence, zoology, literature, physiology, social psychology, medicine, and so on. The first person to work in this way in Russia was the sociologist and publicist Nicholas Mikhailovsky, one of the founders of subjective sociology.

Georg Simmel considered it was inevitable, in the initial period of the forming of the new science, for a kind of 'scientific adventurism' to appear. The fashionable label 'sociology' was stuck onto whatever one liked; tense, hostile relations built up between devotees of the new science and spokesmen of the other humanitarian sciences (history, jurisprudence, political economy, etc.). That was why sociology, a Cinderella in the state universities of Russia, migrated into journalism and into publicistic activity.

In its early stages Russian sociology was a prisoner of naturalism, which aimed at deciding all social questions by relying on biology. At the end of the 60s and on the early 70s the subjective school, with its orientation to social psychology, was particularly popular. In that period Russian sociology was represented on the whole by competing positivist groups, namely, naturalism (organicism), geographical determinism, psychologism (the subjective school), and sociopsychologism. Naturalism, it is true, quite quickly lost credit in Russian scientific circles, although separate, not unsuccessful attempts to resurrect sociology 'on the soil of the general laws of organic life'

continued throughout the whole period of the development of non-Marxian sociology in Russia.

The predominant trend was positivism. In spite of its obvious shortcomings, positivist sociology had favourable results. Researchers' attention was switched to society as a whole, instead of the stereotypes of traditional history (the 'great man' and his deeds), and to the interaction of the various aspects of this social whole (economic, political, everyday, and cultural institutions). That view helped formulate new hypotheses and to 'read' already known facts in a new way. Positivist sociology was therefore considered in this stage as the 'natural science of humanity', which employed all the other sciences as a 'treasury' of facts and empirical generalisations for developing its own abstract laws of social statics and dynamics.

This methodological orientation, however, did not help put the new science's own rapidly developing house into order and promote its self-awareness. Contemporaries noted:

> In its present form sociology is a pile of descriptive materials, partly worked over, partly very little touched by scientific criticism, and a pile of words, hypotheses, theories whose aim is to process this material and deduce a system of reasoned generalisations from it.[3]

The second stage in the development of Russian sociology can be called that of 'theoretical-methodological criticism'. The critique was made in the context of the rising schools and trends in order to consolidate them, but was also carried on between them. In the 80s, in conditions of unprecedented state terror (after the assassination of Alexander II in March 1881), the total amount of sociological publications fell somewhat, but never quite wholly disappeared.

In the 1890s to the 1910s there was a marked intellectual revival and a wide spread of Marxism on the one hand and of antipositivist theories on the other. A conception was clearly traceable in the theoretical and methodological disputes of that time that the attempts of the early positivists to create a new science had been nothing but epistemological naïveté, and that a sociological science was still 'in the scaffolding stage'. Concepts like 'people', 'ideals', 'intelligentsia', which had seemed so

clear and understandable in the first stage, were critically evaluated. The relations of sociology and other humanitarian sciences were reconsidered; and some spokesmen of the latter began to recognise the fruitfulness of the sociological point of view. Naturalistic reductionism was sharply criticised.

The antipositivists, who spoke under a slogan of defence of methodological principles, which came later to be called 'historicism' (Alexander Lappo-Danilevsky, Paul Novgorodtsev; and others) were proponents of neo-Kantianism. Their fight against positivists of all hues led to a clear differentiation being made in the first decade of this century between the various currents of Russian sociology.

Classic positivism gradually grew into neopositivism, oriented to empirical studies, functionalism, and scientism. The struggle between the many competing theories in capitalist sociology and their joint confrontation with Marxist sociology intensified. The names of Comte, Spencer, Quételet, Simmel, Durkheim, and others might escape attention, depending on the theoretical sympathies and antipathies of the Russian sociologists concerned, but not Marx's.

The polemic between sociologists of the various trends, even when it was one-sided at times and unfair, was useful in the end because it helped them clarify the ideological shifts in society and to understand their own mistakes and the opposite point of view. The theoretical-methodological positions and evolution of the ideas of a number of the leading sociologists took shape in the fire of criticism.

The third stage in the development of Russian sociology can be called that of 'methodological consolidation'. The theoretical and empirical standard of knowledge as a whole rose then. During the first decade of this century the number of Russian sociological publications almost trebled compared with the last decade of the nineteenth century.

A stratification according to ontology (problems of social reality and the laws of its functioning and development) and social epistemology (the possibility of knowing social reality by some method or other) can be traced in each of the trends of Russian sociology. Two different treatments of social reality—realism and nominalism, and a host of eclectic transitions between them—can be found in the history of sociology from

Comte to our day. According to the realist interpretation, society is a real organic entity, and primary as regards the individual. The components of this entity are the products of the action of historical forces that have deep, natural roots in the past. The individual never existed outside these forces and the unity of their manifestation. Only through society or, as sociologists say, 'through socialisation', does the individual become a personality. In Russia sociological realism had supporters both among positivists and among certain antipositivists.

Opposed to realism was the nominalist approach, which treated social reality as the initial, self-sufficing interaction of individuals, and society as an aggregate of these interactions and personalities. A cult of militant individualism, psychologicalness, and subjectivism, was closely linked with this approach. Certain positivists, many antipositivists and neopositivists were proponents of nominalism, although they employed different arguments, of course.

In social epistemology, on the one hand, there was methodological objectivism (positivist and neopositivist), usually oriented to the methods of the natural sciences and quantitative procedures. Some antipositivists, who took a stand on objectivism, tried to give the theoretical social sciences the form of the latest social philosophy, that removed the old dilemma of the philosophy of history and sociology about the knowability of social reality. On the other hand methodological subjectivism had supporters not only among antipositivists but also among some of the positivists (psychological reductionism).

An idea of the trends in Russian sociology can be got from Table I.

(1) It is quite obvious from it that Russian sociology was in the mainstream of world sociological thought, and that Russian scholars were constantly noting this fact. It is also clear that positivism was the main trend in sociology in Russia. Quantitatively positivists provided the bulk of Russian sociological literature, and many of them acquired world prominence (P. Lilienfeld, M. Kovalevsky, N. Kareev, E. de Roberty, Pitirim Sorokin).

(2) A specific feature of Russian sociology was the appearance in it, earlier than in the sociology of any other country, of a positivist monadology and methodological subjectivism (the

Table I

	Positivism	Antipositivism	Neopositivism
Social ontology	1. Positivist holism (organicism, geographical and demographic determinism, 'sociological series'—Eugene de Roberty and others. Natural laws of social matter (evolutionism). 2. Positivist monadology (the subjective school, psychologists: Nicholas Korkunov, and others). Natural laws with moral sanctions.	3. Antipositivist holism (the social philosophy of Simon Frank, Leo Karsavin; Neo-Hegelianism, Neo-Slavophilism (Nicholas Danilevsky, Constantine Leontiev). Universal law of an organismic kind (philosophical interpretation). 4. Antipositivist monadology (Neo-Kantianism). 'Natural law'. Necessity and duty.	5. Recognition of the need for a synthesis of holism and monadology, but coming down objectively onto lines of monadology (Pitirim Sorokin, Takhtarev). Functional laws.
Social epistemology	6. Positivist methodological objectivism (all versions of naturalistic reductionism (pluralism—Kovalevsky, monism—de Roberty). 7. Positivist methodological subjectivism (the subjective school and all other forms of psychological reductionism in positivism: early Frank, L. Obolensky, and others).	8. Antipositivist methodological objectivism (Neo-Hegelianism, Neo-Slavophilism). 9. Antipositivist methodological subjectivism (Neo-Kantianism)	10. The methodological objectivism of neopositivism (scientism, the critique of introspection).

subjective school). Another feature was the attempt of neopositivism (primarily behaviourism) to synthesise sociological holism and monadology, at a time when most supporters of this trend in the West took their stand on positions of monadology and elementarism.

(3) Russian sociologists attached principled significance to their theoretical disagreements (positivism, antipositivism, and neopositivism). As regards social ontology they all recognised the existence of laws of social statics and dynamics, although they varied widely in their interpretation of the essence of these laws and the possibility of combining them with a moral evaluation. But it was characteristic of all the trends that they had, to some extent, a common methodological basis. This was characteristic in particular of the subjective school and neo-Kantianism. Both trends, which constantly polemicised against each other, relied on psychological reductionism when tackling most problems, although they also resorted to various arguments and had different philosophical traditions.

(4) No trend in Russian sociology ever existed in absolutely pure form. The logic of the evolution of ideas led to certain sociologists passing from one school to another. Frank, for instance, who belonged to the subjective school, began to profess antipositivist methodological objectivism. Certain of the Russian sociologists understood the need for a broad synthesis of the various trends in sociology. Kareev, for instance, tried to synthesise all the tenets of the subjective school, and V. Khvostov of neo-Kantianism. Kovalevsky and de Roberty continued the cross-integration of positivist trends in the early twentieth century, and Frank of antipositivist ones in the 1920s. Finally, Sorokin wanted, at the end of the 30s, to create an 'integralist' sociology by synthesising the positivist and antipositivist schools. Its significance can only be correctly understood in the context of the whole of Russian sociology.

What were the leading themes of the Russian sociological literature of the time? Most of it was devoted to constituting sociology as an independent science, to discussion of research fields and methods, and of the main theoretical and methodological principles (monism-pluralism, realism-nominalism, evolutionism-functionalism, and so on), and concepts. Tendencies to demarcate philosophy and sociology were intensified. The

new science developed its empirical foundations and quantitative methods, and developed working techniques.

Another important theme of Russian sociological literature was discussion of problems of social dynamics (evolution, progress), the phases of evolution and their sequence, the 'laws and formulas' of progress, and historical comparative methods. Evolutionist sociologists suggested, though with certain reservations, that there was a universal, linear process of social evolution along which nations passed through one and the same stages of development. Social and natural conditions always generated a more or less identical culture, customs, and institutions, so that the diversity of socio-cultural phenomena could be reduced, with strict observance of positive methods of research, to a single genetic series. Hence the widespread interpretation of general sociology as 'genetic'.

On the other hand, however, such an interpretation of social evolution encountered unresolvable inner contradictions from the very start. Should one, continuing the line of the old social philosophy, speak about the global evolution of a single society ('organicists', proponents of 'geographical determinism', 'social Darwinists', and so on) or was it necessary to concentrate on studying the relatively completed cycles of development of separate spheres and areas of society, viz., the economy, political institutions, culture (Kovalevsky and others)? How was the principle of total change to be combined with the idea of the unity of the social system, all elements of which were striving to maintain functional equilibrium ('organicists', de Roberty, and others)? The sociologists of the second half of the nineteenth century persisted in trying to answer these questions.

Positivists deduced the many 'laws of evolution', 'stages of development' of society mechanically from certain general philosophical principles rather than from empirical data. From that a tendency arose to fit the facts to oversimplified schemes. And positivist sociologists interpreted the principle of development itself as very simple orthogenesis, not seeing anything in preceding history except 'preparation' of capitalist civilisation. They tried, of course, either not to notice the social antagonisms of the latter or to subject it to utopian criticism (the subjective school and the neo-Slavophiles).

It is an interesting fact that it was in Russia that the first

critical article appeared against the linear, evolutionary conception of history. Its author, Nicholas Danilevsky, set out his anti-evolutionist idea in *Russia and Europe* in 1869. His sociological doctrine was based on an idea of isolated, local 'cultural-historical types' (civilisations). He denied interaction and mutual influence of peoples during history, made an absolute of the uniqueness and inimitability of the inner wholeness of cultures, and involuntarily went to the other extreme of ignoring the main lines of world development.

A gradual drawing on the data of ethnology, and comparative study of past cultures broke up the old evolutionary schemes. At one time or other anti-evolutionism became the vogue (Robert Wipper, Sergius Bulgakov, and many others), to the point of recognition of the significance of 'sociological laws' as functional only (Pitirim Sorokin).

The third most important theme of Russian sociology was social structure (order) and social behaviour. The underlying social phenomenon and initial entity for analysis was interpreted, following Simmel, as 'social interaction' (Kareev, Sorokin, and others). Constant, mass, reproductive interaction gave 'social relations' and 'social life', while personal involvement in it gave 'social connections'. But the sociologists of the various trends treated 'interaction' differently. For Kareev it was a kind of foundation on which the other parts of the social structure were built up, i.e., groups, organisations, and institutions. B. Kistyakovsky, in accordance with the neo-Kantian orientation, was interested in the psychological (motivational, normative) content of interaction. Sorokin studied the inner structure, and interaction, on the plane of social behaviour.

The 'social group' was a main theme of Russian sociology. Sorokin (one of the founders of theories of social mobility and social stratification) concerned himself with problems of the classification of social groups and the theoretical, methodological principles of classification. Problems of the contrasting of the organised 'social group' and particular congeries of people (groups, the public, the collectivities) aroused very great interest. Problems of the intelligentsia and social classes were insistently posed, and several conceptions of the nature of social classes and the intelligentsia existed among Russian sociologists. According to the 'socio-ethical' conception, the intelligentsia

was a heterogeneous social group, not part of the estates of the realm, and above class, which had special spiritual, mental properties. According to another conception the intelligentsia was an independent 'social class'. Spokesmen of a third conception regarded the intelligentsia from religious and cultural positions.

The general posing of problems of the social psychology of various groups was developed and concretised through study of a number of specific problems, for example, of military psychology, the socio-psychological nature of hooliganism, and so on.

The concepts of 'status', 'subscriber', and 'position' were employed to define the place of the individual in a group. The regulating actions of the individual were defined by the concept 'norm'. Both positivists and neo-Kantians recognised the importance of normative examination of group life. Other components of social structure that attracted attention were the institution of power and authority (law, bureaucracy, the nature of the state, etc.).

Special attention was paid to two polar states: 'social order'—mutual aid, co-operation, solidarity; the integration of social groups—and conflicts and struggle between them. A specific concretisation of these states was the problem of peace and war. One of the best-known conceptions of lasting peace, which is now called 'world government', took shape early in Russian sociology.

Development and application of the theoretical content of the concept 'social system' attracted the attention of a number of sociologists. The first of them to employ the term 'social system' to describe the general state of society was the economist and philosopher Alexander Bogdanov, who regarded society as a union of many elements. The external elements were the physical and natural environment (climate, fauna, flora), and interaction with other societies; the inner elements were primarily groups with functions of government and management, and their ideology.

Sorokin defined 'social system' in the early 1920s as a 'system of systems'. In accordance with that he distinguished several types of social system: the interpersonal interaction of a group; the articulation of groups (cumulative groups), and society as a whole. According to him sociology was primarily interested in social facts. The main thing for real unity of a

social system, he suggested, was the existence of causal-functional relations between the three inner components of interaction: viz., the agents (individuals), the acts of interaction, and symbols (conductors), and also the existence of similar connections between the interactions themselves in broader contexts. There was no structural unity without a close, permanent functional connection of the components, but only spatial or mechanical co-existence. At the end of the 30s he regarded the concept 'social system' differently, in the spirit of 'socio-cultural integration', and stressed the primacy of spiritual integration rather than functional connections, of symbols, 'laws-norms', etc., rather than individuals and acts. Later he wrote that this revaluation was a further development of the tradition of Max Weber and Wilhelm Dilthey, on the one hand, and of the Russian neo-Kantians on the other.

Yet another important theme of Russian sociology was personality. One must note, however, that there was still no great development of the theory of personality in sociology in those years. The theories of Nicholas Mikhailovsky and Peter Lavrov on personality as independent individuality were not, strictly speaking, sociological. Mikhailovsky's conception was a humanist one of the human being, i.e., he considered personality to be the yardstick of progress. His ideal was all-round development, 'diversity' of the personality. On the background of biological reductionism, which reduced personality to a 'cell', 'function', 'corpuscule' of the social organism, above all in conditions of autocratic despotism, this idea was undoubtedly progressive.

As for the theoretical and ideological importance of Lavrov's theory of the 'critically thinking individual', it was the first developed form of the intelligentsia's self-awareness in Russia. Lavrov considered the essence of history to be the development of culture (traditional social forms inclined to stagnate) into civilisation (conscious historical movement, realised by 'critical thought'). Since thought, according to him, was real only in the individual person, the main driving force of history were 'critically thinking individuals', i.e., the progressive, advanced intelligentsia.

The subjective sociologist Kareev employed the term 'social role' when speaking of personality, but extremely metaphori-

cally; he gradually came to a conviction that the only fruitful approach was treatment of personality simultaneously as the product of social relations and of their reformer.

While Sorokin did not resort to the term 'role', he gave a similar theoretical interpretation of the part of the individual (the personality as a subscribing member of different groups).

Another important problem for Russian sociology, in addition to society and personality, was that of culture. Social philosophy concerned itself in the main with this. Danilevsky's 'culturology' evoked long, bitter disputes. Even when people did not agree with it, they were considerably influenced by it (for example, Sorokin). As for the narrower, sociological study of culture, it was regarded as the result and determinant of social actions and interactions (Sergius Yuzhakov, Eugene de Roberty, and other sociologists). De Roberty, Mikhail Tugan-Baranovsky, and Peter Struve suggested that the different elements of culture interacted in various succession, non-synchronously, with a lag (the Russian version of the theory of 'cultural lag'). The integration of the different elements and systems of culture interested Sorokin (in the later period of his work).

One must specially note that Russian sociologists responded in a lively way to the works of Western colleagues. They devoted much effective effort to translating, reviewing, and surveying the foreign sociological literature. Practically all the well-known sociologists of the West (Lester Ward, Giddings, Gabriel Tarde, Gumplowicz, Herbert Spencer, Ferdinand Tönnies, Georg Simmel, Max Weber, Emile Durkheim) were translated into Russian and commented on. Broad personal contacts were maintained. Kovalevsky, for example, was well acquainted with almost all the leading sociologists at the turn of the century. Russian sociologists were not simply pupils and popularisers of foreign scholars, but in several cases critically developed and applied many of their ideas to other conditions and tasks, and carried them further. An example was Danilevsky's already mentioned cultural typology, later accepted by Oswald Spengler and Arnold Toynbee. Mikhailovsky laid the foundations of psychologism (description of the phenomenon of imitation) before Tarde. The work of Bekhterev and Pavlov had great influence on laying of the scientific foundations of behaviourism. Sorokin created the theory of social stratification and mobility.

The picture of sociological activity in Russia would not be full if we did not deal with empirical (above all, statistical) social studies, the more so that they arose much earlier than sociology itself, as, incidentally, in all European countries. There were differences, however. Along with national government statistics there were local government (Zemstvo) statistics, an institution that had no like in other countries. (The Zemstvo was a local government body set up in a number of provinces of European Russia by the land reform of 1864). Zemstvo statistics were mainly compiled to study the state of agriculture and the course of its socio-economic development. The local government intelligentsia acquired great influence in the Zemstvos at the end of the nineteenth century. Zemstvo statistics accumulated immense data on the state and development of peasant farming in Russia.

At the beginning of the 20th century, the activity of the Zemstvo statistical services was followed up and broadened by many journals, scientific societies, and private persons (teachers, doctors, economists, and engineers), who started to carry out empirical social studies at their own risk and on their own responsibility. 'The questionnaire is more and more winning the sympathy both of individuals and of whole organisations in order to clarify and study social life,' the journal *Russkaya mysl* wrote.[4]

The matters studied by sociology and the statistical services in the main concerned the life and position of the poor, drunkenness, suicides, and so on. These were 'sore subjects' in Czarist Russia. The empirical studies were sometimes not entirely irreproachable from the scientific standpoint either on the organisational plane or the methodological. In some cases there was little sampling, the quantitative criteria of measurement were debatable, the questions were often ambiguous, the comparability of the data obtained was poor, and so on. But there were also interesting studies distinguished by quite representative data that still have value today for both the historian and the sociologist.

As the substance of these studies was grasped, methodological works appeared more and more frequently that tried to draw conclusions from empirical scientific practice and to eliminate its shortcomings. A conviction grew in the first decades of this

century of a need for joint work by theoretical and empirical sociologists. Institutionalisation of sociology began at the beginning of the century. The ideological leitmotif of its evolution in Czarist Russia was recognition of the need for capitalist reforms, which inevitably brought Russian scholars into conflict with the bureaucratic machinery. The authorities, in turn, were suspicious of any display of free thinking and scientific search. That deformed the institutionalising of sociology. The business of founding specialised professional institutions, chairs, journals, and courses dragged on for decades. The way into the universities for sociology was cleared with difficulty. Russian sociologists therefore, in the majority, had no special sociological training. Historians, lawyers, economists, graduates of military schools and of science faculties, journalists, clergymen, civil servants, and so on, engaged in sociology.

The interest of the broad public in the theoretical and empirical aspects of this science rose sharply from the middle of the 1890s, as was recorded in polls of readers' tastes at the beginning of the century. Separate works appeared and special 'programme-guides' to the diversity of the sociological literature appeared, and the first bibliographies, unique for those years, were compiled.[5] Kareev's *Introduction to the Study of Sociology* (1897), for instance, was intended both as a textbook for the thematic teaching of sociology and as an original, historical, critical study of the main trends in the sociology of those years. The 'Russian tradition' in the historiography of sociology, which in time included the works of major sociologists (Kovalevsky, Sorokin, and others), began with it. But since the teaching of sociology was still banned in Russian educational institutions, Kovalevsky, de Roberty, Novicow, and other Russian sociologists took part in the work of sociological seminars in the universities of France, the USA, Germany, and Belgium.

In 1901 Kovalevsky and de Roberty founded the 'Russian School of Social Sciences' in Paris. The press of the day justly appraised it as a 'first model of a sociological faculty' that had no analogy in world science and the system of higher education.

The main aim of this School's teaching was sociology and (which was specially important) its application to 'the econo-

mic, political, and spiritual problems of Russia'. Kovalevsky considered that sociological theory had not yet been established, but that the sociological approach had already made progress in concrete social sciences (ethnography, jurisprudence, history of religion, etc.). Sociology therefore had to be taught 'from the standpoint of its method and scientific tasks', and should not expound any particular doctrine dogmatically. The main systematic courses were devoted to the philosophical foundations of the natural and social sciences, the history of sociology, and its interdisciplinary relations. A large number of special courses were read on every possible kind of sociological problem (problems of the family, authority and power, the state, religion, and so on). The practical exercises were devoted to the following themes: (1) Russia's industrial and technical progress; (2) the Zemstvo and the history of self-government; (3) the press, political trends and groups; (4) the working class and peasantry. The writing and defence of dissertations on sociology after three years of study were contemplated.

The School also set itself other tasks, viz., to acquaint foreign scholars with the most important problems of Russian society and its social science, and to determine the degree of applicability of Western scientific conclusions to Russian reality. The foreign collaborators with the School included Alfred Fouillée, Lucien Lévy-Bruhl, Tarde, de Greef, and many others. 'The Russian School' and its founders were proponents of the capitalist democratic renewal of Russia.

In spite of the School's being closed on the demand of the Czarist government, it played an important role in establishing Russian sociology. Its many lectures and courses became the themes of further scientific studies by the lecturers and students. It helped arouse interest in sociology in various circles of Russian society. During the five years of its existence it graduated more than 2,000 students; reports of its work got into the provincial, as well as the St. Petersburg press. Finally, the many sociological organisations (student circles, associations, sections, chairs, societies, etc.) that sprang up after the February Revolution were based on its scientific and teaching experience.

In 1908 a private Psychoneurological Institute was founded with the first chair of sociology, which continued the program-

me of the Paris School. The chair compiled courses of sociology, and prepared four issues of the collections of articles *New Ideas in Sociology*. In 1916 K. Takhtarev and Pitirim Sorokin, who were working in the chair, organised the Kovalevsky Sociological Society and, in 1920, a faculty in Petrograd University.

Theorists of the most varied trends had written about the need for direct observation, questionnaire inquiries, polls, surveys, experiments, and quantitative methods in sociology, and about the need to found institutions and institutes in which research would be carried on by groups of scholars working to a definite plan. 'Such sociological laboratories,' one sociologist remarked, 'are only just being born in our time, but the whole future of sociological science largely depends on their success.'[6] When the Institute of Social Psychology, the Laboratory of Collective Reflexology, and the Sociological Institute were finally founded, they gathered much empirical material on scientific organisation of labour, the social regrouping of the population of Petrograd and changes in the 'standard of living' of various strata during the war and the Revolution. (Later Sorokin's theory of stratification, mobility, revolution, and continuum of town and country was based on this material.).

Thus, sociological science attained a certain maturity in Russia in the early 1920s. Its criteria were a striving for theoretical and methodological integration, development of the empirical level of research, and institutionalisation (organisation of teaching and research). A very important distinguishing feature of it was the conviction that it should serve the people. One social worker had written in an early positivist manifesto 'Our Science and Scholars' in 1861:

> real science should be democratic, without a professional caste character serving only the authority of the powers that be. Its purpose should not be the personal benefit of the scholars themselves but achievement of the human ideal and solution of social problems; it should not be science for science's sake, but science for the people. Pursuit of these principles is the moral obligation of sociology.

(The author of the manifesto called it 'the physiology of society'.)

But, as Marxism and the proletarian movement gathered

strength, the situation changed. The Revolution of 1905 demonstrated the whole flimsiness and class narrowness of middle-class liberalism. The idea of sharing power with the nobility and gentry won out in the social sciences. Capitalist sociology was ready, in the changing circumstances, to give theoretical help to 'scientifically' explaining the need for such an alliance. The October Revolution of 1917 finally summed up this sliding of Russian middle-class sociology into the camp of counter-revolution. It was then that Sorokin uttered his notorious phrase: 'Revolution is a gloomy person'.

The deep inner crisis of Russian social studies became clear after the October Revolution: there was no one integral theoretical position; a principled eclecticism swamped scholars. Sociologists of far from similar views lost their illusions about a socilogical science that could not forecast and explain dramatic events, viz. the world war of 1914 and the socialist revolution of 1917.

A new stage in the development of sociology in Russia was linked with the names of V. I. Lenin and G. V. Plekhanov, who laid the foundations of a Marxist sociology. Lenin's contribution was particularly significant; this science was developed in his works both in its general theoretical and in concrete aspects.

Lenin developed the question of the role of the subjective factor in history in detail, defined the concept 'class', created a theory of imperialism, and enriched the Marxian theory of the state (*Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism; The State and Revolution*). His critique of the philosophical and sociological conceptions of Machists and neo-Kantians (*Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*) is of great methodological importance. His doctrine of the two tendencies in the national question provided the key to the decisive problems of the development of nations in the contemporary period ('The National Question in Our Programme', 'The Working Class and the National Question', 'Critical Remarks on the National Question', etc.). His *The Development of Capitalism in Russia*, and his article 'Sociology and Statistics', and other works are examples of Marxian analysis of social processes.

The Revolution of 1917 opened a new page in the history of Russian sociology, but that is the theme for a separate book.

Notes

[1] V. I. Lenin. What the 'Friends of the People' Are and How They Fight the Social-Democrats, *Collected Works*, Vol. 1 (Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1986), p 267.

[2] V. Maikov. The Social Sciences in Russia. *Finsky vestnik*, 1846, 1.

[3] K. Takhtarev. The Main Trends in the Development of Sociology. *Sovremennyi mir*, 1910, 8, 10, 12.

[4] *Russkaya musl*, 1913, 3: 39.

[5] M. Kovalevsky, The Fate of Sociology after 15 Years of the Twentieth Century. In: *Istoriya nashego vremeni* (St. Petersburg, 1914); S. Yuzhakov. Diary of a Journalist. How to Study Sociology. *Russkoye bogatstvo*, 1885, 11.

[6] V. Khvostov. *Osnovy sotsiologii* (The Fundamentals of Sociology) (Moscow, 1920), p 69.

CONCLUSION

Igor Kon

Western sociology went through a complex evolution in the second half of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth. From a quite vague programme like, for example, Comte's conception, it had become one of the leading branches of social studies by the beginning of the twentieth century, with claims to a firm position in the universities, and already occupying such a position in some countries. Primitive reductionist theories gave way to much more complicated and differentiated conceptions. Sociology developed its own conceptual apparatus. Systematic development of questions of methodology and research techniques began. The range of problems studied was broadened. Parallel development of general theory and empirical social studies was succeeded by an orientation to their integration, which caused an essential shift in the orientations of both theorists and empiricists. All that promoted further growth of professionalisation and institutionalisation, especially from the 1920s. As for theory, non-Marxian sociology draws inspiration today from the authors of its 'classical' period like Max Weber, Durkheim, Simmel, and Pareto.

The relations of these authors to one another were very complex, as we have seen. The officially unrecognised, marginal Simmel, it would seem, enjoyed the greatest popularity during his lifetime.[1] His work was widely known, not only in Germany, but also in France, the United Kingdom, Italy, Russia, and the USA, where Small was an active propagandist of it; in a poll of 258 American sociologists in 1927 Simmel was second in popularity to Spencer among European sociologists.[2] Durkheim, while rejecting Simmel's conception as a

whole, recognised the precision of his theoretical thought and his 'sense of the specificity of social facts'.[3] Simmel's influence on his friend Max Weber was very strong; the latter saw a plethora of important new theoretical ideas and exceptional precise observations in his works.[4] In Coser's view

> Simmel's social 'forms', for example, have a great deal in common with Weber's ideal types. Weber's insistence on the crucial importance of money in the emergence of rationalised economic system owes much to Simmel's 'Philosophy of Money'.[5]

That did not, of course, exclude profound differences between these thinkers. In 1908 Weber began an article on Simmel, but did not finish or publish it, so as not to lessen Simmel's chances of getting a professorship at Heidelberg University by his criticism (the manuscript of the article, found in his Munich archives, was only published in the early 70s). In that article Weber noted the unacceptability of the main principles of Simmel's methodology, criticising it for the ambiguity and formality of the concept 'interaction', and for confusing subjectively intentionalist and objectively significant social senses, and for his addiction to metaphysical problems.[6]

There were also serious disputes in those years between other theorists. Tönnies, for example, whose fame outside Germany was much less than Simmel's (his main work was only translated into English in 1940 and into French in 1944), was drawn into a sharp polemic with Durkheim. In a lengthy, and on the whole positive review of Tönnies' book in 1889, Durkheim interpreted *Gemeinschaft* as an organic community, and *Gesellschaft* as a mechanical one, reproaching Tönnies for considering the second type of social organisation artificial, and not seeing the transition from the one type to the other. Tönnies naturally did not agree with such an interpretation of his views, and in turn, when reviewing Durkheim's *The Division of Labor in Society* (1896), wrote that Durkeim's whole sociology was a modification and variant of Spencer's, which was also unjust.

Neither Simmel nor Tönnies, Durkheim nor Weber existed for Pareto. A similar mutual ignoring existed between Durkheim and Weber; Durkheim only mentioned Weber once, in a note

on the First German Sociological Congress. Weber, too, did not in general name Durkheim. In the opinion of Bendix and Roth, incidentally, Weber was not yet a notable figure in Germany before 1914, and in other countries until later.[7] The recognised *maitre* of French sociology, Durkheim, was of course better known in Europe. Although all his principal books, including excerpts from *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*, which appeared in 1912, had been translated only in Russia during his lifetime,[8] his ideas had a quite broad influence already in the early part of the century. But in the USA Durkheim's popularity lagged behind that of his old opponent Tarde right down to the 1930s; Tarde's principal books had already been translated into English at the turn of the century. The American sociologists who were best known in the first quarter of the century were Cooley, Giddings, Ross, Sumner, and Ward.[9]

We must remember, when discussing the relations of sociologists at the turn of the century, and their partial ignoring of each other, that each of them had his own group of experts and consultants. These groups often had no direct relation with sociology, their activity, moreover, did not cross. In Durkheim's circle of intellectual authorities were the historian Fustel de Coulanges, the philosophers Emile Boutroux and Charles Renouvier. Simmel was personally associated with the leading cultural figures of his time; among his friends and correspondents we find Auguste Rodin, Rainer Maria Rilke, Edmund Husserl, Martin Buber, Albert Schweitzer, and Ernst Troeltsch. It is impossible to understand Simmel's works out of the context of the German philosophy of the day. Tönnies counted among his inspirers the lawyers Rudolf Ihering, Otto Gierke, and Henry Maine, the economists Karl Rodbertus and Adolf Wagner, the ethnologists J. J. Bachofen and Henry Lewis Morgan, but especially Karl Marx. It is interesting that he meant his main work for philosophers. The development of Weber's ideas was linked with a number of outstanding German historians (Heinrich von Sybel, Theodor Mommsen), economists (Wilhelm Roscher, Karl Knies, Gustav Schmoller, Adolf Wagner, Lujo Brentano, and Werner Sombart), and philosophers (Wilhelm Dilthey, Wilhelm Windelband, Heinrich Rickert). His most important works were seen initially as economic or

historical. The intellectual context in which Pareto worked was even more specific.

The various sources of ideas and intellectual orientations naturally gave rise to different styles of sociological thinking.

But whatever complex collisions occurred between the spokesmen of the various trends of non-Marxian sociology of the turn of the century, the main object of their attack was Marxism. As the English historian of sociology, John Madge, remarked:

> European scholars in the last century have been exposed to a continuous debate with Marxism, and even when the antagonist has not been specified, one can detect fragments of dialogue aimed toward Marxism.[10]

There are few at present who would dispute the view of the American historian Stuart Hughes that Marx was 'the midwife of twentieth-century social thought'.[11]

How did academic science react to the development of Marxist sociology?

Before the 1880s and 1890s the principal method of the bourgeois 'critique' of Marxism was to gloss it over. Individual scholars, it is true, usually those who were linked somehow with social democracy or were interested in the condition of the working class, had read Marx earlier. Tönnies, who was attracted to socialism in his youth, had already carefully read Volume I of *Capital*, which had a big influence on him. Le Play was acquainted with Marx and cited him, although he drew contradictory conclusions from the same premisses; as one of his Austrian correspondents remarked, Marx proposed to build a new society while Le Play wanted to improve the old. But the name of Marx was a rarity in those years among university professors.

At the end of the last century the position changed. At the first congress of the International Institute of Sociology in October 1894, Marx's theory was already the centre of attention, thanks to the speeches of M. M. Kovalevsky, Enrico Ferri, F. Tönnies, P. Lilienfeld, and others. No one doubted that historical materialism was a sociological theory; Ferri even wholly approved of it, declaring that 'sociology will be socialist

or it will not be'.[12] Many sociologists of the beginning of this century had a high opinion of Marx's scientific contribution. Small, for example, wrote:

> Marx was one of the few really great thinkers in the history of social science. ... I confidently predict that in the ultimate judgment of history, Marx will have a place in social science analogous with that of Galileo in physical science.[13]

Respectful opinions of Marx are also to be met among his antagonists like Weber, Durkheim, and Pareto.

The point is not formal recognition of his contribution. There are many, very important *elements* in the content itself of the conceptions of Tönnies, Durkheim, Weber, and other major sociologists of the turn of the century that, if not borrowed directly from historical materialism, are at least *close to it*, especially when one has in mind not the answer or solution, but the *posing* of problems. Neither Durkheim's sociology of knowledge, nor Weber's theory of capitalism, not Tönnies' dichotomy of the 'commune' and 'society', nor Pareto's theory of ideology, can be understood without allowing for that circumstance, since none of these conceptions, taken as a whole, differed from Marx's. But the relation of 'academic sociology' to Marx's theory was, on the whole, preconceived and unobjective.

On the one hand, Western authors (for example, Weber) tried to prove that there was no organic link between Marx's theory of capitalism and his socialist programme. On the other hand, there was a common opinion that sociology dialectically 'removed' socialism as such. Small and Vincent wrote in their textbook of sociology that sociology needed to be distinguished from socialism, and that socialism was related to sociology in the same way as astrology to the initial stage of astronomy, and alchemy to the sources of chemistry. Marx's sociology, like his socialist theory, thus belonged to the prehistory of science.

The theoretical divergences were closely linked with the ideological ones. Marx's sociological theory combined an understanding of society as a system (the concept of formation, mode of production as the foundation of the social structure, the principle of determinism) with dialectical historism (devel-

opment as a struggle of opposites, class struggle as a mode of resolving antagonistic contradictions, etc.). When dialectics, which was completely foreign to positivist thinking, is 'taken out' of Marxism, historical materialism is converted into a version of the eclectic 'theory of factors' or into vulgar 'economic materialism'. That is what positivist sociologists did whose acquaintance with Marxism was for the greater part not with the original works, but with various vulgarisations, from which Marx, as is known, dissociated himself.

One must also take into account that many of the most important works that brought out the *dialectics* of Marx's social philosophy (*The German Ideology*, the *Philosophical and Economic Manuscripts*, etc.) were published only several decades later, while Engels's letters about historical materialism, in which he criticised the simplified understanding of his and Marx's ideas, were practically unknown outside Social-Democratic party circles.

At the end of the nineteenth century Marxian sociological theory became known to 'academic' science, hostile to it ideologically, predominantly in a simplified, vulgarised form. It was depicted as a primitive reductionist theory based on a monocausal understanding of determinism that denied the significance of people's conscious activity, and so on. That caricatured 'Marxism' did not, of course, stand up to any kind of serious philosophical criticism. And each new 'refutation' consolidated the negative stereotype, so that sociologists educated in the 1920s to 1940s, with rare exceptions, knew Marxism even worse than the preceding generation.

Real, historical Marxism had nothing in common with the vulgar stereotype. In the works of Marx and Engels we find a thorough description of the sociological theories of English utilitarianism, and the traditionalist romantics, and a profound criticism of the views of Comte, Spencer, and the naturalist school in sociology. At the turn of the century, a critical analysis of capitalist sociological theories had an increasing place in Marxist literature. Suffice it to recall the works of Franz Mehring against the neo-Kantian falsification of Marxism, against Sombart and *Kathedersozialismus* (academic socialism), Labriola's polemic with Croce, and Plekhanov's critical analysis of the works of Rickert, Croce, Tarde, et al.

Lenin's criticism of the 'subjective sociology' of the Russian Narodniks demonstrated the unsoundness in general of reducing the social to the psychological. In *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism*, he brought out the fruitlessness of biologo-energetist interpretations of society's life, and exposed the epistemological and social roots of the neo-Kantian and neo-positivist theories of society. A dialogue between Marxian and non-Marxian sociological theorists has become broader in recent decades, and is having a deeper influence on the development of sociological thought in the West as well as in the East.

Notes

[1] Lewis A. Coser. *Masters of Sociological Thought*, 2nd Edition (Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, New York, 1977); D. N. Levine. Introduction to *Georg Simmel on Individuality and Social Forms* (Univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1971).

[2] Donald N. Levine, Ellwood B. Carter, Eleanor Miller Gorman. Simmel's Influence on American Sociology. *American Journal of Sociology*, 1976, *81*, 4 : 841.

[3] Steven Lukes. *Emile Durkheim, His Life and Work* (Harper & Row, New York, 1972), p 404.

[4] Marx Weber. Georg Simmel as Sociologist (Edited by D. N. Levine). *Social Research*, 1972, *39*, 1 : 153-163.

[5] Lewis A. Coser. *Op. cit.*, p 249.

[6] D. N. Levine. *Art. cit.*

[7] Reinhard Bendix, Guenther Roth. *Scholarship and Partisanship· Essays on Max Weber* (University of California Press, Berkeley, Cal., 1971).

[8] In spite of censorship obstacles Russian publishers were exceptionally prompt in translating sociological literature, so that Russian readers were familiar at the beginning of the century with all the latest ideological currents in Western Europe and the USA.

[9] D. N. Levine, E. B. Carter, E. M. Gorman. *Art cit.*, pp 813, 840.

[10] John Madge. *The Origins of Scientific Sociology* (Tavistock Publications, London, 1970), pp 559-560.

[11] H. Stuart Hughes. *Consciousness and Society* (Vintage Books, New York, 1961), p 74.

[12] *Cahiers internationaux de sociologie*, 1961, *31*, 2: 177.

[13] Albion W. Small. Socialism in the Light of Social Science. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 1912, *17*, 6: 809-810.

A

Abstraction–19, 27, 179
Adaptation–105, 109, 110
Alienation–199, 232
Ameliorism (see Meliorism)–51
Anatomy–77
Anomie–236, 241, 251
Antagonism, capital and labour–226, 228, 230
Anthropology–46, 47, 153
Anthroporacial school–71
Anthroposociology–73
Anti-positivism–158, 344
Apriorism–246
Association–59, 79, 216, 232
Authority–242, 251
Average man–137

B

Baden school–165, 264
Belief–216, 217
Bio-organic school–74, 78, 79
Bourgeoisie (see middle class)–15, 17, 43, 151, 304
Bureaucracy–170, 286, 291

C

Capitalism–14, 16, 18, 99, 151, 152, 198, 203, 211, 228, 230, 231, 255, 257, 258, 261, 291, 296, 284, 337, 338
Capitalistic economy–292
Capitalistic mode of production–18
Causal dependence–220, 227, 316
Census–132
Change–12, 31
Charisma–170, 289, 292, 293, 295
Chemistry–25, 155
Christianity–300
Church–243, 261
Civil society–12
Class–11, 15, 84, 86, 99, 128, 129, 147, 152, 210, 231, 313, 318, 327, 328, 347, 355
Class struggle–20, 23, 90, 151, 184, 334
Classification–24, 25, 28, 58, 164
–crimes of–133
–emotions of–320
–human relations of–180
–population of–129
–social forms of–179, 180
–social norms of–180
Climate–62, 67, 68
Collective consciousness–29, 77, 98, 100, 212, 217, 218, 223-25, 239, 242, 244, 248
–individual–216
Collective idea–212, 215, 217, 218
Collectivism–45, 249
Commerce–16
Communism–22, 38
Community (Gemeinschaft)–10, 175-77, 287
and society (Gesellschaft)–173, 175-77, 181, 361
Competition–23, 89, 151, 228
Conflict–82, 84, 86, 87, 90, 185, 210, 228, 229, 250
Consensus–33, 185
–omnium–28, 33
–universalis–207
Conservatism–332
Co-operation–32
Corporativism–142
Corporation–209, 228
Correlation–220
Crime–221
–crisis of capitalism–231
–economic–206, 222, 226
–moral–226
–physics–159
–political–206

–positivist model–320
–social–153, 208, 231, 233, 239, 249, 251, 321
–spirit–242
Criminality–148
Crowd (masses)–106, 107, 111, 277
Culture–57, 60, 65, 66, 69, 102, 154, 156, 161, 186, 201-03
Custom–89

D

Derivations–322-26, 333
–classification–322
Determinism–316, 319
–cultural–62
–geographical–62, 65-67, 70, 140
–mechanistic–155, 199
–social–222
–technological–68
Deutsche Gesellschaft für Soziologie–168, 174
Development–12, 18, 28, 31, 34, 47, 57, 73, 74, 165, 180, 181, 183, 194
–linear–12, 53, 153, 154
–models of–194
–stages of–35, 36
Dialectics–54
Dialectical thinking (thought)–26
Differentiation–48-50, 52, 53, 58, 60, 65, 76, 86, 197, 230, 330
–sciences of–9, 14
Diffusion of culture–64, 154
Diffusionism–154
Disintegration–16, 241
Division of labour–10, 32, 34, 47, 50, 52, 54, 192, 197, 220, 223, 225-29, 287
Dominance–85, 192, 285, 286, 288
–charismatic–289, 290
–legal–286, 291, 292
–patriarchal–287
–traditional–287-89
–types of–285
Dynamic sociology–31, 36, 37

E

Economic exchange–261
Economics–283, 291, 296, 338
Education–208, 209, 240
Elite–327, 328, 330, 333
–circulation of–326-31
–ruling–321, 327, 328
Emotion (sentiments)–327, 333
Empirical social research–5, 9, 13, 69, 122-24, 126, 127, 132, 134, 139, 142, 144, 147, 166, 207, 357
Empiricism–19, 29, 58, 219, 246
Energetics–60
Enlightenment–179, 207, 214
Entropy–60, 61
Environmentalism–67-71
Equality–231
Equilibrium–32, 316, 319, 331, 333
–dynamic–317
Ethics–296
–confucian–300
–conviction of–293
–responsibility of–293, 294
Ethnocentrism–84, 90
Ethnography–47, 153, 155
Ethnology–53, 57, 154
Everyday life–218
Evolution–6, 7, 23, 53
–laws of–49
–mechanistic–59
–social–36, 47, 48, 50, 52, 58, 84, 85, 88, 89, 152, 153, 219, 316, 346
–society–31, 37, 49
–sociology of–7, 357
–stages of –154
Evolutionary theory–57, 81, 83
Evolutionism–27, 44, 47, 51, 54, 57, 79, 112, 118, 151, 155, 156, 197, 242, 312
–psychological–97, 98, 101

Expectation–275, 276
Exploitation–34, 84

F

Factor–28, 34, 39, 58, 62-04, 66, 69, 71, 78, 80, 82, 84-06, 88, 89, 97, 99, 101, 141, 146, 158, 177, 184, 201, 221, 223, 227, 233, 234, 237, 249, 325
–human–153
Family–32, 69, 75, 128, 138-41, 143
Fascism–74
Fashion–193
Fetishism–35
Feudalism–17
Folk psychology (Völkerpsychologie)–97, 103, 104
Freedom–44, 197, 231
–valuative judgments from–259
–value from–290
–will from–79
Freudism–103
Function–48, 52, 220
–economic–64
–social–15, 59, 230, 240, 245
Functionalism–155

G

Geographical school–61
Geography–61, 62, 66
Geometry–10, 40, 155
Geopolitics–70
Gestalt-psychology–161
Good–17, 238
Group–11, 45, 85, 87, 90, 114-16, 177, 186, 192-94, 215, 331, 347, 348
Group psychology–105

H

Historicism–175, 342
History–7, 156, 255, 338, 349, 355
–sociology of–4, 7, 39, 88
Homo duplex–240
Homo oeconomicus–275
Human being, model of–275
Humanism–331

I

Ideal–284
Idealism–79, 217, 338
Ideal type–260-62, 264, 269, 271, 283, 294, 358
Ideas–28
Ideology–184, 186, 208, 246, 321, 323, 325, 333
Idiographic thinking–163
Imitation–109, 112, 113, 118, 193
–theory of–195, 113, 155
Imperialism–151
Indicator–140
Individual–27, 31, 114-17, 177-80, 224, 225, 241, 272, 275, 276, 316, 318, 326, 328, 330
Individualisation–86, 193
Individualism–15, 32, 44, 54, 100, 146, 239, 241, 267, 274, 275, 284
Inductivism–219
Industrialisation–16, 133, 281
Inequality–71, 89, 228, 229
Innovation–112
Instinctivism–97, 100-03
Instincts–33, 101-03, 116, 320, 329
Institutions–31, 34, 39, 47, 49, 53, 72, 74, 75, 78, 124, 218, 220, 330
Institutionalisation
–psychology of–96
–sociology of–5, 6, 87, 168, 169, 357
Integration–23, 32, 49, 53, 234, 242
Intellect–197
Intellectualism–198
Intellectuals–15, 347, 349, 351
Interaction–112, 114, 118, 192, 250

Interactionism–98, 114
Interest(s)–11, 33, 86, 89, 228, 239, 240, 250, 259, 316
International Institute of Sociology–169, 207
International Sociological Association–5
Intuitivism–264
Irrationalism–293, 313, 320, 324

J

Jurisprudence–47, 207, 274, 276
Justice–229, 231

L

Labour (see also division of labour)–69, 144, 208, 282, 283
Law–212, 273
–historical school of–174
–repressive–224
–restitutive–225
Legitimacy–276, 288, 290, 292
Liberalism–17, 44, 51, 151, 152, 200, 257, 293

M

Marxism–7, 170, 184, 185, 202, 203, 209, 249, 305, 354, 360, 362
Mass (see also Crowd)–106, 277, 327
Materialism–158, 163
–economic–257, 270, 334
–historical–202, 360
Materialist conception of history–19
Mathematics–10, 155
Mechanics–10
Mechanicism–53, 59, 153, 158, 312
Mechanistic school–59
Meliorism–99
Meritocracy–251
Metaphysical method of thinking–26
Metaphysics–19, 24, 156, 159
Methodological principles–20, 21, 161, 170, 222, 267, 270, 271, 333
–attitude–275, 277, 285
Methodology–27, 59, 76, 79, 88, 117, 139, 169, 217, 284, 287, 290, 315, 358
–relation of the natural sciences and human studies–159, 163, 164, 264
Methods–6, 13, 26, 29, 30, 57, 59, 67, 100, 156, 157, 162, 164, 170, 179, 181, 237
–analogy–97, 105
–biographical–7
–comparative–29, 30, 153, 221, 222
–empirical–110, 122, 126, 135
–experience–259
–experiment–29
–explanation–219, 221, 233, 242, 244, 268
–functionalist–219, 222
–historical–30, 222
–inductive–217
–intuition–162, 259
–logico-experimental–170, 314
–monographic–139, 140
–observation–29, 129, 138, 217
–objectivation–179
–positive–23
–quantitative–135, 147
–understanding–195, 196
Model of society
–evolutionist–108
–mechanistic–10
–organic–10, 48, 54
–system–19
Money–197-200, 275
Money economy–197, 198
Monism–57, 64, 217
Monotheism–35, 63
Morality–180, 208, 209, 212, 238-41

'Moral statistics'–143
Motivation–266, 267, 318
Motive–11
Myths–105

N

Nationalism–66, 294, 295
Naturalism–53, 54, 57, 63, 71, 152, 157, 158, 159, 163, 214, 215
Natural right–10
Natural sciences–10, 156
–and humanitarian sciences–159, 160, 163, 264, 265
Natural selection–88
–nature of man–240
Neoevolutionism–55
Neoidealism–158
Neokantianism–157, 166
Neopositivism–100, 345
Nominalism, sociological–15, 47, 108, 115, 274
Nomothetic method (thinking)–163
Norm–221, 318

O

Organicism–54, 64, 74, 75, 114.
Organisation–16, 37, 64, 68, 71, 77, 80, 100, 114
Organism–26, 30, 35, 45, 46-48, 58-60, 66, 75-7, 79, 220, 221, 225
Orthogenesis–153
Ownership–38, 69, 230

P

Paris Sociological Society–207
Pathology (see social illness)–221
Personalism–79
Personality–114, 115, 118
Philosophy–22
history of–9, 28, 158-61, 338, 343
–life of–159, 190, 191, 293
–positivism of–23-05
–social–9, 43, 345
Physics–155, 156
Physiocrats–11
Physiosociology–25, 60, 122
Political arithmetic–122
Political economy–255, 256, 274
Politics–11, 37, 132, 182
Polytheism–35, 303
Population–77
Positivism–21, 22, 26, 31, 36-08, 79, 156-08, 217, 313, 330, 341-44
Possibilism–70
Poverty–126-28, 133, 148, 210
Power–33, 38, 84, 185, 285, 328, 331
Principles of Historical and Sociological Study–6, 59, 86, 88, 113, 179, 197, 217, 218, 258, 263, 268, 273, 276
–causality–222
–laissez faire–16, 33, 44, 88, 98, 152, 169
Professionalisation of sociology–169, 357
Proletariat–24, 38, 183, 255
Prostitution–200
Protestantism–234, 282, 296
Psychoanalysis–272
Psychologism–97, 114, 117, 217, 259, 268, 340, 350
Psychology–156, 265
Public opinion–111, 113, 180

R

Racialism–70, 72
Rationalisation–197, 281, 282, 285
Rationalism–216, 293, 294, 324, 330
Rationality–179, 181, 183, 270, 281
–formal–281-84, 286, 292, 295
–material–282, 283

Realism–28, 81, 83, 115, 214, 216, 342
Reason–178, 181, 319
Reductionism–86, 90, 215, 252, 319-21, 342, 343, 349
Relativism–162, 201, 222, 323
Religion–31, 35-07, 180, 208, 212, 214, 216, 224, 242-47, 295, 296, 322
Residues–319, 320, 322, 325, 329, 333
Revolution–36, 209
–bourgeois–15
–industrial–43
–physics in–155, 156
–social–138
Romanticism–182
Russian School of Social Sciences–352, 353

S

Sacred and secular (profane)–242, 243
Scientism–156, 342
Self–114-17, 199
Selfishness–36, 251
Social–81, 82, 88, 90, 126
Social action–266-69, 272, 274, 276, 281, 284, 285, 317-19
–affectual–278, 279
–classification–317
–logical–317, 318
–non-logical–317, 318, 323, 333
–sociologism–207, 208, 215, 221, 223, 232, 243, 248, 250
–traditional–278, 279
–types of–269
–value-oriented–278-80
–zweckrational (rational)–268, 269, 271, 274, 278, 279-81, 284
Social behaviour–11, 71, 170, 177, 236, 265, 269, 320
–deviant–236, 241
Social being–16, 324
Social coercion–211, 242
Social contract–11, 37
Social control–251
Social Darwinism–66, 67, 73, 79-81, 83
Social ecology–62, 69
Social environment–62, 65, 70, 71, 139, 212, 216, 219, 233, 249
Social fact–19, 29, 88, 100, 160, 170, 211-13, 218, 221, 315
Social hygiene–125, 133, 142
Social information–123, 124, 135
Social illness–233
Social life–20, 26, 27, 31, 37, 38, 45, 46, 53, 63, 71, 80-02, 86, 88, 123, 133, 137, 158, 161, 162, 176, 178, 181, 185, 213, 215, 216, 225, 230, 274, 281, 325
Social morphology–77, 212
Social order–31, 33, 36, 38, 40, 180, 206, 240, 251
Social physiology–77
Social process–12, 23, 33, 34, 40, 52, 60, 83, 98
Scientific and technical (progress)–156
Social reality–268, 269, 272, 274, 283
Social relations–12, 179
–antagonistic–38
–economic–11
Social role–32, 36, 37, 114
industrial–223
–professional–225
Social sciences–155
Social system–16, 31, 39, 49, 53, 317, 348, 349
Social technology–88
Sociolisation–86, 117
Socialism–38, 209-11, 360, 361
–scientific–20
–utopian–17, 337
Sociation, forms of–91, 244, 250
Society–9, 10, 23, 26, 37, 36, 190, 191, 208
–antagonistic–229
–and individual–48, 49, 214-16, 225, 229, 241, 267

–and nature–30, 62, 66
–and religion–246
–as aggregate–59, 108
–as organism–48, 49, 108, 221
–as reality–83, 243
–as sui generis–28, 108, 214
–as system–10, 19, 52, 248, 316, 319
–as whole–16, 17, 31, 37, 39, 220, 267
–bourgeois–12, 151, 153, 170, 232
–capitalist–14, 20, 51, 88, 122, 251, 283
–civil–12
–class–227
–definition of–10, 76, 189, 245
–industrial–280
–modern–225, 226, 283
–primitive–223, 244
–traditional–267, 269, 280, 282, 283, 288
–types of–45, 47, 174, 224
Sociological theory–5, 6, 29, 31, 34, 273, 337, 340, 362
–social measurement of–61
–positive–29
Sociology–9, 14, 25, 27, 28, 39, 46, 83, 86, 100, 107, 108, 122, 153, 159-61, 166-69, 179, 186, 190, 191, 208, 209, 233, 314, 338-43, 345-54
–and biology–45, 46, 264
–and history–30, 46, 159, 163, 164, 264, 265, 343
–and logic–325
–and other social sciences–46, 83, 118, 119, 213, 214, 273, 314
–and philosophy–213, 214
–and psychology–265, 266
–applied–162, 265, 266
–as general theory of society–46
–bourgeois–204, 355
Comte's definition–27
–empirical–13, 179, 252
–formal–187, 190-93, 204
–Marx–20, 342, 355
–philosophical–195, 196
–positive–23, 25
–pure–181, 191, 195
–religion–295-304
–scientific–17, 20
–subject-matter–76, 211, 218
Socium–77
Solidarity–208, 223, 224, 226, 227, 229, 232
–organic–78, 224, 225, 228
–mechanical–224
Solipsism–62
State–31, 33, 44, 66, 99, 267, 286
Statics–23, 31, 44, 345
Statistics–10, 61, 135, 137, 138, 142, 143, 219, 234
Structural functionalism–39, 53, 248, 306, 333
Structure–10, 12, 19, 31, 34, 39, 53, 77, 79
Struggle for existence–88-90
Subjectivism–338, 343
Submission–86, 192
Suicide–222, 232-37
classification–235
System approach–55

T

Technology–112
–scientific research of–7, 127, 147
Theology–24
Totemism–208, 242

U

Understanding–160, 264-66, 268-70, 273, 280, 297
Urbanisation–16
Utilitarianism–108
Utopia–38

V

Value-relevance–165, 259
Values–196, 227, 238, 260, 281
Volk spirit–104
Voluntarism–28, 58

W

Way of life–69
Wealth–15, 211
Will–175, 177-81, 185
World Sociological Congress–5

NAME INDEX

A

Abrams, Philip–131, 149, 172
Adorno, Theodore–203, 306
Alexander II–341
Alexander the Great–289
Alpert, Harry–252
Ammon, Otto–73, 93
Aronson, Elliot–120
Ashton, Thomas S.–148

B

Bachofen, Johann J.–175, 359
Bacon, Francis–219
Bagehot, Walter–82, 83, 94
Baldwin, James M.–107, 112, 114, 119
Barnes, Harry Elmer–8
Barth, Paul–249
Bastian, Adolf–189
Baumgarten, Eduard–309, 311
Bebel, August–20
Becker, Howard–8
Bekhterev, Vladimir–60, 107, 350
Bell, Daniel–251
Bendix, Reinhard–172, 308, 359, 363
Bentham, Jeremy–17, 44
Bergson, Henri–159
Bernard, Lister L.–103, 120, 169
Bernard, Luther–54
Bessner, Wolfgang–310
Bismarck, Otto von–144
Boas, Franz–112, 154, 155
Bogardus, Emory–332
Bogdanov, Alexander–348
Bonald, Louis de–15, 141, 214
Booth, Charles–127-31, 147, 148
Borkenau, Franz–332, 336
Bouglé, Célestin–207, 217, 253
Boutroux, Emile–359
Bowley, Arthur L.–131, 149
Brentano, Lujo–359
Bryce, James–167
Buber, Martin–359
Buckle, Henry T.–39, 63, 64, 92
Buddha–289
Buffon, Georges de–13, 14
Bulgakov, Sergius–347
Burckhardt, Jacob–152, 153, 171
Burke, Edmund–15

C

Caesar–289
Carey, Henry C.–59, 61
Carter, Ellwood B.–56, 172, 363
Cassirer, Ernst–298, 310, 311
Cavalli, Luciano–8
Chamberlain, Houston S.–72, 73, 93
Chizhevsky, A.L.–69, 93
Clark, Terry Nichols–8
Cleon–290
Colbert, Jean-Baptiste–132
Cole, Stephen–148
Comte, Auguste–22-42, 45, 46, 49, 53, 75, 83, 96, 108, 147, 157, 161, 167, 207, 214, 219, 221, 223, 232, 253, 314, 342, 343, 357, 362
Condorcet, Jean A.–23, 27, 132, 207

Cooley, Charles H.–54, 56, 115-19, 121, 162, 359
Coser, Lewis A.–8, 39, 42, 121, 188, 308, 332, 336, 358, 363
Cournot, Antoine A.–108
Cousin, Victor–63
Cresson, André–27, 41
Croce, Benedetto–264, 362

D

D'Alembert, Jean M.–132
Danilevsky, Nikolai–153, 344, 347, 350
Dante, Alighieri–199
Darlington, C. D.–95
Darwin, Charles–18, 44, 57, 58, 62, 81, 82, 332
Davy, Georges–207, 252
Dealey, James Q.–98
de Greef, Guillaume–94, 353
de Roberty, Eugene–207, 252, 343-46, 350, 352
Demolins, Edmond–68, 69, 140
Dilthey, Wilhelm–159, 160-63, 165, 171, 190, 258, 259, 264, 265, 349, 359
Dion, Michel–251, 254
Dreiser, Theodore–52
Dreyfus, Alfred–52, 313
Durkheim, Emile–39, 54, 80, 108, 113, 121, 124, 144, 148, 155, 167, 169, 170, 187, 206-54, 267, 298, 305, 306, 332, 342, 350, 357-59, 361, 363

E

Eisermann, Gottfried–336
Elesh, David–148
Ellwood, Charles–119
Engel, Ernst–143
Engels, Frederick–18, 19, 20, 21, 121, 126, 210, 309, 326, 335, 362
Espinas, Alfred–79, 94, 252

F

Fauconnet, Paul–207
Febvre, Lucien–92
Fenton, Steve–254
Ferguson, Adam–11
Ferrarotti, Franco–8
Ferri, Enrico–108, 312, 360
Fouillée, Alfred–39, 79, 94, 353
Fourier, Charles–17
Frank, Simon L.–344, 345
Frazer, James–242, 298
Freud, Sigmund–95, 102, 270, 323
Freyer, Hans–264, 307
Frobenius, Leo–154
Fustel de Coulanges, Numa-Denis–359

G

Galileo Galilei–282, 361
Galton, Francis–127
Garofalo, Raffaele–108
Gehlen, Arnold–203
Genghis Khan–290
Gerth, Hans–308
Giddens, Anthony–8, 252, 254
Giddings, Franklin–80, 98-101, 120, 168, 169, 350, 359
Gierke, Otto von–359
Glazer, Nathan–251
Gobineau, Joseph-Arthur–72, 73
Goethe, Johann W.–161
Goldfrank, Walter–149
Gorman, Eleanor–56, 172, 363
Gouldner, Alvin–306
Graebner, Fritz–154
Granet, Marcel–207
Graunt, John–13
Guerry, André-Michel–134, 143
Gumplowicz, Ludwing–83, 87, 94, 168, 169, 350

H

Habermas, Jürgen–306, 311
Haeckel, Ernst H.–75
Halbwachs, Maurice–207
Halley, Edmund–13
Harvey, David–93
Haushofer, Karl–66, 92

Hegel, Georg–12, 39, 74, 103
Helvetius, Claude A.–11, 16
Henderson, Lawrence J.–332, 333
Herbart, Johann F.–104
Herder, Johann–161
Heyden, Günter–92
Hill, James J.–52
Hitler, Adolf–290
Hobbes, Thomas–11, 44, 90, 101, 173, 175, 178, 179, 303
Hobhouse, Leonard–167
Hofstadter, Richard–54-56, 89, 95
Holbach, Paul Henri–11, 16
Hollitscher, Walter–95
Horkheimer, Max–203, 306
Hoult, Thomas F.–171
House, Floyd–332
Hughes, H. Stuart–158, 171, 360, 363
Humboldt, Alexander–64
Hume, David–11, 44, 96
Hummett, Jan–254
Huntington, Ellsworth–67, 68, 92
Huntington, Samuel–251
Husserl, Edmund–159, 165, 298, 359
Huxley, Thomas–27, 80

I

ibn-Khaldun–68
Ihering, Rudolf–359
Isaiah–302
Izoulet, Jean–252

J

Jacob, François–95
James, William–103, 114, 121, 332
Jaures, Jean–209
Jesus–289, 290
Juquelier, P.–108, 120

K

Kant, Immanuel–44, 159, 189, 198, 200, 207, 239, 303
Kareev, Nicholas–338, 340, 343, 345, 347, 349, 352
Karsavin, Leo–344
Kautsky, Karl–20, 210
Kay-Shuttleworth, James–125
Kedrov, B. M.–41
Kellermann, Paul–42
Khvostov, V.–345, 356
King, Gregory–13
Kistyakovsky, B.–347
Kjellén, Rudolf–66, 92
Kluckhohn, Clyde–332
Knies, Karl–256, 294, 359
Koenig, R.–185
Kon, I. S.–8, 42, 171
Korkunov, Nicholas–344
Kovalevsky, Maxim–169, 207, 338, 343-46, 350, 352, 353, 356, 360
Kroeber, Alfred–69

L

Labriola, Antonio–20, 210, 254, 362
Lafitau, Joseph–14
Lagrange, Jouis–23
Laplace, Pierre S. de–13, 132
Lappo-Danilevsky, Alexander–342
Lassalle, Ferdinand–210
Lavoisier, Antonie Laurent–13
Lavrov, Peter–349
Lazarsfeld, Paul F.–138, 150
Lazarus, Moritz–104
Le Bon, Gustave–106-108, 119, 120, 244, 277, 305
Lécuier, Bernard–8, 21, 148, 149
Le Dantec, Felix–27
Leibnitz, Gottfried–173
Lenin, V. I.–7, 18, 20, 21, 53, 55, 91, 155, 337, 355, 356
Leontiev, Constantine–344
Le Play, Frédéric–69, 128, 138-141, 143, 149, 167, 206, 360
Levenstein, Adolf–146, 147, 150
Levine, Donald N.–56, 172, 363

Levy-Bruhl, Lucien–209, 298, 353
Lexis, Wilhelm–144, 149
Lilienfeld, Paul–76, 78, 83, 169, 343, 360
Lindsey, Gardner–120
Lipset, Seymour–251
Locke, John–11, 44, 96, 175, 179
Lombroso, Cesare–39, 69, 108, 312
London, Jack–52
Lorenz, H. A.–95
Löwith, Karl–284, 309
Lukes, Steven–252, 363
Luther, Martin–113
Lycurgus–289

M

Machiavelli, Nicolo–303, 332
Madge, John–8, 360, 363
Maikov, Valerian–338-40, 356
Maine, Sir Henry–175, 359
Maistre, Joseph de–15, 214
Malthus, Thomas–13, 44
Marcuse, Herbert–306
Martindale, Don A.–8
Martineau, Harriet–40
Marvin, F. S.–42
Marx, Karl–18-21, 95, 121, 151, 171, 173, 184, 202, 209, 210, 229, 248, 249, 252, 275, 282, 283, 296, 304, 305, 309, 325, 326, 332, 334, 335, 342, 359
Maurice, Allais–336
Maus, Heinz–7
Mauss, Marcel–207, 209
Mayer, Carl–294
Mayer, Hugo–294
McDougall, William–101-03
Mead, George H.–117, 118, 121
Mechnikov, L. I.–70, 93
Mehring, Franz–362
Menger, Karl–175
Merleau-Ponty, Maurice–310
Merton, Robert–237, 332
Meyer, Hugo–93
Michels, Robert–312
Mikhailovsky, Nicholas–107, 112, 120, 340, 349
Milgram, Stanley–120
Mill, James–17
Mill, John S.–96, 108, 119, 157, 161, 165, 219, 220, 314
Mills, C. Wright–308
Mitzman, Arthur–8, 295, 310
Mohammed–289
Mommsen, Theodor–359
Mommsen, Wolfgang–J.–189, 295, 308, 310
Monge, Gaspard–23
Montesquieu, Charles–23, 108, 207
Morgan, Lewis H.–175, 359
Mosca, Gaetano–312, 313
Mougeolle, Pierre–68, 93
Moynihan, Daniel–251
Müller, Hans-Peter–252, 254
Müller, Johannes–75
Müller, Max–63, 243
Müntzer–113

N

Napoleon Bonaparte–22, 289, 290
Napoleon III–141
Nietzsche, Friedrich W.–101, 106, 152, 153, 171, 173, 190, 270, 302, 303
Nisbeth, Robert A.–8, 251
Novgorodtsev, Paul–342
Novicow, Jacques–78, 207, 352

O

Oberschall, Anthony R.–8, 21, 143, 148-50, 167, 168, 172
Obolensky, L.–344
Ostwald, Wilhelm–60, 92
Owen, Robert–17

P

Pantaleoni, Matteo–312
Parent-Duchatelet, Alexis J.–133, 134

Pareto, Vilfredo–60, 169, 170, 248, 306, 312-36, 357, 358, 360
Park, Robert E.–168
Parsons, Talcott–8, 39, 54-56, 171, 266, 308, 309, 332, 333, 336
Pavlov, Ivan–350
Pericles–290
Perrin, Robert G.–52
Petty, William–13
Plekhanov, Georgi–20, 166, 172, 355, 362
Plessner, Helmuth–203
Poggi, Gianfranco–8
Poincaré, Henri–169
Pope, Whitney–254
Proudhon, Pierre J.–210

Q

Quételet, Adolphe–25, 69, 126, 134-138, 140, 142-44, 149, 342

R

Ranke, Leopold von–262
Ratzel, Friedrich–65-67, 92
Ratzenhofer, Gustav–86, 94
Reclus, Elisée–70, 93
Reiner, Robert–254
Renan, Ernest–39, 63
Renouvier, Charles–359
Retzius, Anders J.–73
Ribot, T.A. –101
Ricardo, David–256
Rickert, Heinrich–164-66, 171, 172, 259-63, 359, 362
Rilke, Rainer Maria–359
Ritter, Karl–64, 65, 92
Rockefeller, John D.–52
Rodbertus, J. Karl–359
Rodin, Auguste–359
Roscher, Wilhelm–256, 294, 359
Ross, Edward A.–112, 119, 121, 359
Roth, Guenther–172, 308, 359, 363
Rothacker, Erich–203
Rousseau, Jean Jacques–11, 297
Rowntree, B. Seebohm–131, 149
Runett-Hurst, A. R.–149

S

Saint-Simon, Claude de–17, 21, 23, 40, 41, 207, 209, 210, 214, 252
Savigny, Friedrich von–174, 175
Schäffle, Albert–76, 77, 94, 169
Scheler, Max–203, 310
Schelling, Friedrich von–74-75
Schlanger, Judith E.–94
Schluchter, Wolfgang–306, 311
Schmidt, Gert–306, 311
Schmoller, Gustav von–142, 144, 169, 175, 256, 359
Schnapper-Arndt, Gottlieb–145, 149
Schopenhauer, Arthur–153
Schweitzer, Albert–359
Sechenov, I. M.–27
Seligman, Ben B.–307, 335
Semple, Ellen C.–67, 92
Seyfarth, Constans–306, 311
Shils, Edward–172
Sighele, Scipio–106
Simiand, François–207, 209
Simmel, Georg–56, 112, 161, 162, 169, 172, 187, 189-205, 340, 342, 347, 350, 357, 363
Sinclair, John–124, 125
Small, Albion W.–87, 88, 94, 95, 168-70, 357, 361, 363
Smith, Adam–11, 44, 117, 256
Smith, Robertson–242
Solon–289
Sombart, Werner–94, 203, 257, 359, 362
Sorel, Georges–313
Sorokin, Pitirim–141, 162, 298, 343-45, 347, 348, 350, 352, 354, 355
Spencer, Herbert–27, 43-56, 58, 59, 75, 76, 81, 83, 88, 98, 99, 108, 147, 161, 169, 173, 223, 253, 314, 342, 350, 357, 358, 362

Spengler, Oswald–203, 350
Spinoza, Baruch–173, 175, 177
Spranger, Eduard–161
Sprondel, Walter M.–311
Stammler, Rudolf–203
Steinthal, Heymann–104, 189
Stern, William–161
Steward, John A.–93
Stirner, Max–101
Struve, Peter B.–55, 350
Sumner, William G.–54, 84, 88-90, 95, 168, 169, 332, 359
Sybel, Heinrich von–359
Szczurkiewicz, Tadeusz–94

T

Taine, Hippolyte A.–27, 39, 63, 106, 157, 171
Takhtarev, K.–344, 354, 356
Tarde, Gabriel de–80, 82, 107, 108, 112, 114, 119, 120, 169, 207, 350, 353, 359, 362
Tatham, George–93
Taylor, Edward–243
Thierry, Augustin–11
Thomas, William–89
Timasheff, Nicholas S.–8, 95, 120
Toch, Hans–120
Tönnies, Ferdinand–142, 144, 148, 168-70, 172-88, 190, 223, 253, 310, 350, 358
Tourville, Henri de–69, 140
Toynbee, Arnold–350
Troeltsch, Ernst–203, 359
Trotter, Wilfred–102, 120
Tugan-Baranovsky, Mikhail–350
Turgot, Jacques–132, 161
Tylor, Edward B.–58, 298

V

Vaccaro, Michele Angelo–81, 94
Vacher de Lapouge, Georges–73, 93
Vacherot, Etienne–39
Vallaux, Camille–68, 93
Van den Berghe, Pierre L.–95
Vauben, Sebastien–132
Vayda, Andrew P.–93
Vica, Giovanni Battista–12
Vidal de la Blanche, Paul–70, 93
Vierkandt, Alfred–187
Vigouroux, A.–107, 120
Villermé, Louis–133
Vincent, George–168, 361
Virchow, Rudolf–142
Volney, François de–14

W

Wagner, Adolph–143, 144, 149, 359
Wallace, Alfred–80
Walras, Leon–312, 313, 316
Walter, A.–262, 307
Wallas, Graham–102, 120
Ward, Lester F.–80, 98, 99, 120, 168, 350, 359
Warntz, William–93
Webb, Beatrice–149
Webb, Sidney–131, 149
Weber, Alfred–144
Weber, Max–142, 144-48, 150, 162, 163, 166, 169, 170, 172, 177, 187, 203, 248, 252, 255-311, 349, 350, 357-59, 361, 363
Wiese, Leopold von–187
Wilson, Edward O.–95
Winckelmann, Johannes F.–308
Windelband, Wilhelm–163, 171, 359
Wipper, Robert–347
Wolff, Kurt H.–252
Woltmann, Ludwig–74
Worms, René–78, 94, 169, 207
Woyslawski, Hersch-Leib–203
Wundt, Wilhelm–97, 104, 113, 120, 169, 188, 207

Y

Yuzhakov, Sergius–350, 356

Z

Zeitlin, Irving M.–21
Zeller, Eduard–189
Znaniecki, Florian–162